DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 192 HE 026 802

AUTHOR Glazer, Judith S.
TITLE A Teaching Doctorate? The Doctor of Arts Degree, Then and Now.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, NY. College Retirement Equities Fund.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 75p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110 ($12 members; $14 nonmembers).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Doctoral Degrees; *Doctor of Arts Degrees; Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Outcomes of Education; Program Design; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study examined the Doctor of Arts (DA) degree and its current status. The DA was established in the 1960s and was designed to foster college teaching and to prepare faculty to teach more effectively. The study's first phase included mail and telephone surveys of all institutions offering the DA degrees as well as those institutions that had discontinued it between 1976 and 1988, site visits to nine universities offering the DA, and interviews with current and former programs personnel involved in the programs. The second phase of the study consisted of a national survey of 350 DA degree recipients from 14 universities. Survey data were tabulated and content-analyzed in program choice, academic experience, outcomes of participation, and participant satisfaction. Results found that the DA had the impact of encouraging faculty to rethink the purposes of the doctorate and freeing students who aspired to teach undergraduates from the rigid requirements of the research doctorate. Responses from the survey of graduates revealed that a combination of factors influenced their decision to choose the DA: they are secure in their careers; their satisfaction is high; and two thirds would make similar choices today. An appendix contains the survey of graduates and information on American Association for Higher Education. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Teaching Doctorate?

The Doctor of Arts Degree, Then and Now

ED 363 192

HE 026 802

A Publication of
AAHE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Teaching Doctorate?

The Doctor of Arts Degree, Then and Now

by Judith S. Glazer

Supported by TIAA-CREF

A Publication of the
American Association for Higher Education

THE AUTHOR

Judith S. Glazer is associate professor of education at the C.W. Post Campus of Long Island University, where she is engaged in the professional development of teachers. Her current research interests include curriculum reform, feminist pedagogy, and academic degree structures, and she has written extensively on graduate education and public policy. She is coeditor of the recent book *Women in Higher Education: A Feminist Perspective* (Ginn Press, 1993).

A TEACHING DOCTORATE?
THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE, THEN AND NOW
by Judith S. Glazer

© 1993 by the American Association for Higher Education. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

The opinions expressed in this monograph are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the American Association for Higher Education or its members.

For more about AAHE, see page 67. Additional copies of this publication are available for $12.00 each for AAHE members; $14.00 each for nonmembers, plus shipping. Bulk discounts and express delivery are available. For ordering information, contact:
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
phone 202/293-6440, fax 202/293-0073

The likelihood of change is enhanced when there is a crisis in the environment, when people have a shared interest in change, when there is a power imbalance in the environment, when the environment has experienced structural changes, and finally when it is consistent with the zeitgeist or spirit of the times.

Arthur Levine, *Why Innovation Fails*, p.6

CONTENTS

Foreword ix

Acknowledgments xi

Introduction 1

Chapter 1. Advent of the D.A. 3

Chapter 2. The Multipurpose Doctorate 9

Chapter 3. Diffusion and Decline 17

Chapter 4. Listening to the Graduates 27

Chapter 5. Conclusions 35

Tables 41

Notes 51

Appendix

Survey of D.A. Graduates 60

About AAHE 67

TABLES

Table 1. Phases of Development and Discontinuance of the D.A., by Institution, Field, and Year, 1967-1990

Table 2. D.A. Degrees Awarded in 31 Universities, by Field, 1968-1991

Table 3. Distribution of D.A. Institutions, by Carnegie Classification, 1972 v. 1987

Table 4. Median Number of Years to Degree for D.A. Recipients, 1973-1991

Table 5. D.A.-Granting Institutions and Programs, as of 1991

Table 6. Respondent Profiles for Two Surveys of D.A. Recipients

Table 7. Employment Status of Survey Respondents, by Degree Field

Table 8. Outcomes of Participation in a D.A. Program

FOREWORD

As Judith Glazer recounts here, the D.A. was an innovation aimed at a real need, but one that never found the conditions to flourish. Though this "teaching doctorate" is still offered in twenty-one institutions today, it remains in the shadow of the Ph.D., a casualty, Glazer argues, of the hegemony of research that it was designed to correct.

But the good news for all of us is that graduate programs *are* beginning to pay more attention to teaching. There is now a well-established, well-attended biennial conference on the preparation of graduate students for their work as teachers (cosponsored by AAHE). Over the past several years a number of funding agencies — the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) come especially to mind — have supported ground-breaking projects on the place of teaching in graduate education. A national study conducted by Syracuse University's Leo Lambert and Stacey Lane Tice (and published by the AAHE Teaching Initiative as *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach*) uncovered scores of exemplary TA-training programs, both at the central level and, importantly, in the departments, where the strongest signals about the value of teaching are sent.

It is in this context of increased attention to the teaching roles of college faculty that the story of the Doctor of Arts is especially timely. It may well be that what's needed now is a more inclusive vision of the Ph.D., not an alternative degree. But those who took up the cause of the D.A. (and even those who took it up and dropped it) have experiences and expertise that others can benefit from.

PAT HUTCHINGS
Director, AAHE Teaching Initiative

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph was prepared with assistance from TIAA-CREF and the C.W. Post Campus Research Fund. I wish to express my gratitude to Peggy Heim, senior research officer at TIAA-CREF, and to Theodore Marchese, vice president at AAHE, for their generous support of this project. I also thank Peggy Lane for her skillful assistance in the preparation and analysis of the national survey of graduates; Dolores Thurgood and Julie Clarke, of the Doctorate Records Project, for their conscientious efforts in providing national data sets on the D.A. degree; Lori Charnow, for her technical advice; and Estela Bensimon, Carol Floyd, Yvonna Lincoln, and Robert Silverman for their review of and comments on earlier drafts.

I am particularly indebted to the deans, program directors, faculty, and graduates who answered my requests for information and responded to my surveys. Important insights were gained in conversations with Richard Beringer, Barry Beyer, Earle Clowney, Ted Fenton, Judith Fetterly, Dorothy Finnegan, Timothy Grieder, Joanne Hecker, Martin Kanes, Mary Martin, Barton Pulling, Elaine Sands, Robert Slack, Erwin Steinberg, Joseph Tursi, George Vaughan, Russ Walker, Michael Weber, Ruth Weinreb, Orville Winsand, and William Woodson.

I also benefited from a meeting with Jules LaPidus and his staff at the Council of Graduate Schools; a review of archival data provided by the Doctoral Evaluation Project of the New York State Education Department, Carnegie Mellon University, and the Carnegie Corporation; and attendance at a national conference on the D.A. hosted by Idaho State University. Sincere appreciation also is extended to AAHE's Bry Pollack, managing editor, and Gail Hubbard, assistant editor, for their meticulous review of the manuscript and their excellent suggestions.

Parts of this study were presented in 1992 at annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, in Atlanta, and the Association for the Study of Higher Education, in Minneapolis.

INTRODUCTION

The Doctor of Arts degree was introduced in the 1960s, as an alternative to the research doctorate, at a time of unprecedented expansion and diversification in higher education. The emergent paradigm of "a degree for college teachers" gained credence from educators whose concerns parallel those being expressed today: that Ph.D. programs were overly concerned with specialized research and were insensitive to the needs of the academic labor market, and that undergraduate teaching was being neglected at a time when students were demanding a voice in the curriculum and when the community college sector, in particular, was rapidly expanding.[1] The controversy was intensified by economic forecasts of an impending decline in the 1970s in the demand for Ph.D.'s combined with an anticipated surplus of Ph.D.'s in all but the community colleges by 1975.[2] While the 1960s had begun with the expectation of chronic shortages of new faculty, they ended with conflicting concerns about the overproduction of research Ph.D.'s, declining quality in doctoral programs, and a paucity of qualified faculty to staff the burgeoning community colleges.

Now again, in the 1990s, projections of faculty shortages in the arts and sciences, evidence of a pervasive disaffection within the professoriate, and incompatibility between faculty interests in teaching and institutional demands for research productivity are prompting a resurgent interest in the quality and purposes of the doctorate and how the expectations of the academic labor market influence doctoral education.[3] A central issue in the current dialogue continues to be the relative importance of scholarly research versus pedagogy in the preparation of effective college teachers. The arguments being advanced relate to the persistent incompatibility of specialized research and undergraduate teaching and to the rewards that accrue to faculty who build their reputations through research and publications rather than through classroom teaching.[4] Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, recommends that the definition of scholarship be expanded to give greater legitimacy to teaching and to recognize that knowledge can be acquired through pedagogy as well as through research, synthesis, and practice.[5] Derek Bok, president emeritus of Harvard University, sees the need for "a continuous process of experimentation and reform" to "lift the level of teaching at Harvard and other universities" and outlines sixteen steps intended to achieve that end.[6]

It is in this context of renewed recommendations by Boyer, Bok, and other academic leaders to give greater significance to college teaching and to foster programs to prepare faculty to teach more effectively that the study reported in this monograph was undertaken. Has the D.A. fulfilled its original purpose of providing a teaching

degree? What impact has it had on the institutions, the students, and the faculty who adopted it? What lessons can we learn from the D.A. experience? Has it influenced doctoral education generally, or is the D.A. paradigmatic of the inability of the modern university to reconcile pedagogy and research?"

Chapter 1 analyzes the factors that influenced the adoption of this innovation, the Doctor of Arts degree. Chapter 2 describes the multiple purposes and structures that evolved throughout the organizational change process. Chapter 3 traces the diffusion and decline of the degree, its current status, and trends for the 1990s, incorporating both interviews/surveys of program leaders and data on the D.A. by the Doctorate Records Project. Chapter 4 analyzes the results of a national survey of D.A. degree recipients. And Chapter 5 offers some observations about the problems inherent in doctoral reform and the efficacy and acceptability of a teaching doctorate in the current academic climate.

Methodology

The study reported here proceeded in two phases. The first phase began with mail and telephone surveys of all institutions offering the D.A. degree, as well as those institutions that had discontinued it between 1976 and 1988. Phase 1 continued with site visits to nine universities offering the D.A. and interviews with current and former program directors, department chairs, and deans involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating such programs. Archival materials regarding the origin and development of the D.A., provided by Carnegie Mellon University and the New York State Education Department, were reviewed to supplement the survey and interview data.

The second phase of the study consisted of a national survey of 350 D.A. degree recipients from fourteen universities, conducted in spring 1991. Five private and nine public universities — almost equally divided between research and doctoral institutions — were selected based on their programmatic and geographic diversity. Survey data were tabulated by frequency of response and were content-analyzed in four areas: program choice, the academic experience, outcomes of participation, and participant satisfaction. These findings also were compared with special data sets disaggregated for the D.A. by the Doctorate Records Project from the Survey of Earned Doctorates of the National Research Council."

The combination of qualitative and quantitative data and document analysis yields a multidimensional portrait of the Doctor of Arts that adds to our understanding of organizational innovation in higher education and its impact on institutions, faculty, and students. ◆

CHAPTER 1

Advent of the D.A.

Analyzing the factors that influenced the adoption of the Doctor of Arts degree.

The Doctor of Arts was originally proposed in 1932 at a meeting of the Association of American Universities (AAU), presaging a decade-long debate within the AAU on the validity and efficacy of training doctoral candidates as college teachers.[9] However, it was not until 1961 that anything concrete came of the proposal, when a joint committee of the American Mathematical Society and the Mathematical Association of America approved a report that recommended the establishment of a Doctor of Arts in mathematics as a parallel track to the research-oriented Ph.D.[10] That same year, in a critique of graduate education, Oliver Carmichael, the former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, endorsed the concept of a teaching doctorate, proposing the M.Phil. for community college faculty and the D.Phil. for faculty in four-year colleges and graduate schools.[11]

In 1963, at a national conference on English instruction held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, two alternative proposals were made: (a) institute a D.A. in literature as an intermediate degree without the dissertation or (b) support a teaching Ph.D. that would emphasize composition and linguistics and require a college-based internship and a pedagogical or curriculum thesis.[12] These proposals led to several recommendations both to reform the Ph.D. in English[13] and to inaugurate new degrees — a Doctor of Liberal Arts in English, a Doctor of Arts in teaching (D.A.T.) for community college teachers, and a Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) for those who completed all requirements except the dissertation.[14] Yale University introduced a Doctor of Literary Arts to recognize the publication of work of "serious artistic merit comparable to the Ph.D. in quality and substance" in lieu of the dissertation.[15]

New titles were proposed in the belief that degree structures should be appropriate to the career goals of liberal arts students. The Ed.D., which had been established in 1920 at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, was rejected as too closely identified with schools of education, while the Ph.D. was perceived as primarily a research degree and not amenable to change.[16]

Between 1963 and 1966, pressure built within academe to reform the undergraduate curriculum and to improve the quality of the professoriate. As the reform

wave crested in the mid-1960s, the D.A. gained momentum as an appropriate response to demands for change.

Carnegie Mellon's early role

The Doctor of Arts, as a nonresearch doctorate to prepare college faculty in discipline-specific programs, was conceived in 1966, one year prior to the merger of the Carnegie Institute of Technology and the Mellon Institute of Science to form Carnegie Mellon University (CMU). The initiation of the degree in 1966 by the Mellon Institute's mathematics department was an endorsement of the American Mathematical Society's earlier recommendation. Then, in 1967, the Carnegie Corporation awarded the newly restructured Division of Humanities and Social Sciences $1 million to develop an education center that would incorporate the D.A. into its curriculum reform agenda. The center's purpose was to engage experienced secondary school teachers in collaborative curriculum research and development, culminating in the conferral of a new "curriculum doctorate" in one of four fields — English, fine arts, history, or chemistry. Candidates were recruited nationwide and were supported by a combination of National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Title IV graduate fellowships and Higher Education Title V-C fellowships and grants.[17]

Powerful Advocates

Four constituent groups — the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Carnegie Corporation, the professional associations, and the state higher education coordinating boards — provided a variety of incentives that influenced the development of the D.A. All of these groups were motivated by their mutual interest in curbing the expansion of the Ph.D., their desire to influence academic change, and their ability to exercise leadership in the transformation of doctoral education. Faced with external pressures from these policymakers and concerned about the future of their graduate schools, university presidents and deans of arts and science in turn sought acceptance for the D.A. from department chairs and faculty. These advocates of the D.A. were crucial in formulating its concept and influencing its progress as a viable doctorate.

The Carnegie Commission

Coincidental with the institution of the D.A. at CMU, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, under the leadership of president Clark Kerr, began to promote the reform of higher education. The Commission argued the need to maintain the research primacy of existing doctoral-degree-granting institutions while introducing more options for colleges and universities below the top tier. The D.A. appeared to provide a means to curb the rapid growth of doctoral programs and to augment the number of qualified undergraduate faculty. This was consistent with the

Commission's advocacy of programmatic and institutional differentiation under which the granting of the Ph.D. would be reserved to an upper tier of selective research universities, while the D.A. would become the degree of choice in a second tier of comprehensive institutions whose main mission was teaching and the service professions. Kerr predicted that the D.A. would become "the standard degree for college teaching in the United States, a nonresearch degree of high prestige."[18] He viewed its adoption as part of establishing a four-level degree structure consisting of the A.A., B.A., M.Phil., and D.A. or Ph.D., accelerating the process of degree completion and introducing alternatives to the Ph.D.[19] As a cost-effective, nonresearch, three-year doctorate, the D.A. would mitigate the need for more "research-type universities granting the Ph.D." and address prospective labor market needs for qualified faculty in new community colleges and four-year comprehensive colleges.

Four constituent groups provided a variety of incentives that influenced the development of the D.A. Faced with external pressures from these policymakers and concerned about the future of their graduate schools, university presidents and deans of arts and science in turn sought acceptance for the D.A. from department chairs and faculty.

The Carnegie Corporation

The main change agent in the diffusion of the D.A. was the Carnegie Corporation, particularly its program officer, Alden Dunham. Dunham expressed concern that while 30 percent of all undergraduates were enrolled in community colleges, only 18 percent of community college faculty held doctorates; further, regional and state colleges, motivated by their desire for status and prestige, threatened to abrogate their historical mission of teacher training by seeking doctoral-degree-granting status.[20] He criticized "the overriding influence of the graduate school of arts and sciences and the Ph.D. degree," which "produce competencies, values, expectations, and a reward system that are simply incompatible with undergraduate liberal education."[21] Dunham's solution was to propose the development of a number of "experimental programs . . . in all fields of the arts and sciences for the preparation of teachers in two- and four-year colleges, with special emphasis on lower-division teaching."[22] He argued that no institution should develop the D.A. unless its faculty were willing to recognize the degree for promotion and tenure on an "equal basis with Ph.D. faculty members."[23] Between 1967 and 1976, the Carnegie Corporation provided the New York State Board of Regents and twenty-one public and private universities with $3.2 million in planning grants and fellowship support to design and implement one or more D.A. programs in liberal arts and professional fields. By design, grantees included "all three kinds of institutions: major research universities, regional universities, and small but first-rate private colleges noted for concerns about undergraduate teaching."

The professional associations

Endorsements for the D.A. came from three professional associations — the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior

Colleges — each of which promulgated guidelines for D.A. development within member institutions.[24] Their support strengthened the concept of the D.A. and promoted its acceptance among potential providers of the degree and prospective employers of its recipients. CGS was particularly instrumental in setting the parameters of the D.A. Its 1970 guidelines — adopted by a committee of deans — sought to influence the development of the D.A., describe its essential characteristics, and determine that it be offered only "in well-established universities which already offer the Ph.D. ... ensuring high standards and its acceptance as a new degree in graduate education."[25] A supplemental CGS declaration questioned both the adoption of the D.A. by institutions that had no other doctoral programs and the conversion of the Ed.D. into the D.A., reaffirming that the D.A. "should be granted only by those institutions which have the physical and intellectual resources to offer advanced graduate study leading to doctoral degrees" and that the "admission and retention of graduate students should be as rigorous as for the research doctorate."[26] CGS maintained that its overriding interest was the consistency of "policies, procedures, and standards" for graduate work, no matter what the degree designation.[27]

The state coordinating boards

The New York State Board of Regents authorized the D.A. as a degree for community college teachers for a seven-year trial period beginning in 1971. The degree achieved only limited acceptance, however, and in 1975, the Regents obtained $250,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to encourage the expansion of the D.A. as an appropriate degree for "professional practitioners" in other fields, as well as for teachers. A Doctor of Arts Advisory Board was appointed to review proposals and oversee the development of new programs.[28] This process coincided with the imposition of a statewide moratorium on all new doctoral programs, a reaction to forecasts of an oversupply of Ph.D.'s, a contracting job market, and escalating costs of public higher education. By 1983, the D.A. was established as a professional doctorate in the State University of New York at Albany (English, humanistic studies, economics) and at Stony Brook (foreign language instruction and TESOL); Syracuse University (English and foreign languages); St. John's University (English); Adelphi University (speech audiology and pathology); and New York University (arts professions). In 1973, the Illinois Board of Higher Education approved eight D.A. programs for a five-year experimental period at the University of Illinois at Chicago (chemistry, physics, biology, mathematics) and Illinois State University (English, history, mathematics, chemistry). In both Tennessee and Virginia, the D.A. was approved for comprehensive universities that had no other doctoral programs, a departure from the original CGS guidelines. In 1974, with support from the Carnegie Corporation, Middle Tennessee State University initiated D.A. programs in English, history, physical education, and recreation.[29] In 1980, after being denied approval to offer both the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. degrees by the

State Council on Higher Education for Virginia, George Mason University became the last institution to adopt the D.A. and the first to offer it in education. Ten years later, the Council approved a D.A. in community college education (D.A.C.C.).[50]

The universities

Presidents and deans took the initiative in securing planning grants from the Carnegie Corporation and program approval from their boards of trustees. Department chairs and faculty acquiesced in these initiatives, although their approval was often grudging. In 1970, graduate deans and program directors met at Wingspread under the aegis of CGS to formulate criteria for designing and implementing the D.A. in liberal arts disciplines.[51] The conveners of this conference were optimistic that they were at the vanguard of change and could "revolutionize graduate study," despite recurrent warnings that the D.A. would succeed only if it retained the quality of the Ph.D. while redirecting graduate students from specialized research toward undergraduate teaching in their subject-matter field.

When interviewed and surveyed for this monograph, D.A. department chairs offered a variety of rationales for initiating the degree. When asked, "Why did you establish the D.A.?" directors observed that it was "a way to get ahead of the graduate curve," an opportunity to "prepare English teachers for community colleges in urban settings," and a "new idea for a doctorate that combined research and pedagogy in English literature but without the dissertation." Others reacted more pragmatically, realizing that alternative options for graduate study were limited: "After losing our Ph.D. in English, we segued into this program to train students to teach undergraduates." One former department chair recalled that:

> Our graduate dean made us an offer that we couldn't refuse. He said that the State would give us $50,000 to plan the program; bring in consultants; purchase equipment, books, and teaching materials. We knew that we couldn't get approval for a Ph.D. because of the doctoral reviews, and this seemed like a good option. It would enable us to recruit doctoral students from community colleges and school districts as well as from outside our local recruitment area and offer them fellowship support. It was in our own self-interest to work together and design an interdepartmental doctorate in foreign language instruction.

Summary

Four sets of policy advocates sought to influence the purposes of the doctorate, providing the resources to foster the adoption of the D.A. In 1973, graduate deans and program directors reconvened at Wingspread, again under CGS auspices, to share their

experiences and to assess the status of the degree. As the D.A. was finally implemented, it took on a multiplicity of forms and functions, reflecting the difficulty of implementing innovations within decentralized and diverse higher education systems. ◆

CHAPTER 2

The Multipurpose Doctorate

Describing the purposes and structures that evolved throughout the organizational change process.

The development of the D.A. reveals a great deal about the complexities and the dilemmas of reforming graduate education and redefining the doctoral degree. As Michael Fullan has observed in his research on educational innovation, a key assumption is that "any significant innovation, if it is to result in change, requires individual implementers to work out their own meaning. Significant change involves a certain amount of ambiguity, ambivalence, and uncertainty for the individual about the meaning of the change. Thus, effective implementation is a *process of clarification.*"[32]

Having ratified the concept of a nonresearch doctorate, graduate schools and their faculties reshaped it to reflect institutional norms and disciplinary differences, in the process infusing it with multiple meanings. Within two decades of its advent, the D.A. was transformed into a multipurpose professional degree, and the distinctions between it and the Ph.D. and Ed.D. blurred. Proponents of the D.A. sought outcomes different from those afforded by the Ph.D., which they regarded as a highly specialized, theoretical, research degree. They wanted to shift the focus from specialized content knowledge and technical expertise in independent research to generalized knowledge of the subject, sensitivity to the needs of undergraduates, and effective teaching. Over time, six models of the D.A. developed, each with a distinct set of programmatic characteristics and goals.

(For a listing of institutions adopting the D.A., see Table 1.)

Analytical Models of the D.A.

Almost from the start, diversity in the structure and content of the D.A. was evident in the variety of approaches adopted to foster its acceptance. An analysis of the various models demonstrates the complexity of the diffusion process. The six models that finally evolved were influenced by external catalysts, state regulations, institutional/departmental decisions, and subject-matter determinants.

Curriculum model

The original model for the D.A., designed by the Carnegie Mellon faculty,

emphasized the integration of content knowledge with supervised training in three areas essential to effective teaching: disciplinary research, instructional design, and teaching methodology. In this model, the final project — a curriculum or research dissertation — was intended to demonstrate the student's ability to integrate theoretical and practical knowledge, synthesize basic concepts of good teaching, and communicate understanding of the discipline.[33] For example, one experimental D.A. in history for community college teachers, which was offered by CMU in 1975, combined three summers of coursework; a teaching internship on the teachers' own campuses, in which they field-tested and evaluated a new curriculum; and a curriculum thesis that entailed writing up the results of the internship experience. CMU also utilized the curriculum model in its English and fine arts programs to strengthen the students' training in designing, implementing, teaching, and evaluating an undergraduate curriculum.

Having ratified the concept of a nonresearch doctorate, graduate schools and their faculties reshaped it to reflect institutional norms and disciplinary differences, in the process infusing it with multiple meanings. Within two decades of its advent, the D.A. was transformed into a multipurpose professional degree, and the distinctions between it and the Ph.D. and Ed.D. blurred.

Teaching model

This model emphasized scholarly and applied research related to the improvement of undergraduate instruction in community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive universities. Students were expected to demonstrate broad competence in teaching a substantive discipline or field relevant to undergraduate education, utilizing strategies such as classroom observations, course development, team teaching, communication skills development, periodic seminars, faculty critiques, and curriculum integration projects. The dissertation took many forms, which appeared to contravene CGS guidelines and led to criticism that standards were being compromised. As the teaching model evolved, it was modified to accommodate differences in preparation fields and institutional norms. At the University of Oregon, for example, where the D.A. in English was initiated in 1970 (and discontinued in 1989), it was introduced as a terminal degree for individuals planning to teach in community colleges and small liberal arts colleges, with the understanding that "since it represents all Ph.D. work except the dissertation, it could be followed by the Ph.D. in some cases."[34]

The majority of programs initiated between 1970 and 1973 adopted the teaching model. Two such programs are those at SUNY-Albany (English) and the University of Illinois at Chicago (mathematics and the sciences). At SUNY-Albany, the D.A. in English requires a minimum of sixty-two credits: forty-four in English and at least twelve credits in critical theory and practice, language and language theory, and writing theory and practice. Upon completion of formal coursework, students must pass a three-part comprehensive examination (two parts written and one part oral) and complete both a supervised pedagogical internship and a major project that may be scholarly, pedagogical, or demonstrate a high level of accomplishment in the writing of fiction, poetry, or nonfiction.[35]

The Illinois Board of Higher Education endorsed a policy of encouraging

students "to engage in scholarly and applied research related to the improvement of instruction, curriculum design, materials, and technology used in teaching and to demonstrate a level of competence in teaching in a substantive discipline."[56] At the Univeristy of Illinois at Chicago, technology has become a catalyst for D.A. programs in mathematics, chemistry, biology, and physics. An Office of Instructional Resources Development provides sophisticated instructional equipment and technical assistance for use in designing courses and evaluation projects. Candidates complete an integrated cluster of courses in instructional design and technology, computer instruction, research in educational settings, laboratory teaching methods, and psychological foundations of postsecondary education. The underlying orientation of the instructional technology cluster is problem solving: "Getting an invention designed, tried out in prototype, revised and re-tested until it meets the predetermined specifications for success."[57] This systematic approach links research and practice for advanced doctoral students teaching in community colleges, developing them into "knowledge engineers" capable of building interactive instructional programs using the latest high-tech innovations.

Creative arts model

A third, more experimental model was initiated for practitioners in music, fine arts, and creative writing. Such programs were designed to "supplement, not supplant" recognized performance degrees, particularly the Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) and the Doctor of Music (D.M.). The basic curricular components incorporated performance competencies and pedagogy of the discipline, culminating in a creative project or dissertation. According to a graduate of the D.A. in Music at Ball State, "The program is an amalgam of the D.M., which has a stronger performance focus; the Ph.D., which has minimal performance expectations; and the Ed.D., which basically prepares music teachers." At Carnegie Mellon University, fine arts majors concentrated in visual arts, theater, or music.

Brown University mounted a unique five-year experimental D.A. in creative writing from 1971 to 1976. Compatible with the ethos of the humanistic curriculum movement in its emphasis on personal growth and self-directed learning, it brought together eight young writers with established reputations for a program of independent teaching, writing, and study. There were virtually no requirements regarding coursework, examinations, or credit-hours. The two criteria for conferral of the D.A. were completion of a community-based project or externship (either educational or artistic) and completion of a creative work (a novel or a play) to be approved by a committee of faculty members."

In 1976, a third subtype of the creative arts model, the D.A. in the arts professions, was established at New York University for curators, art therapists, and arts educators. It was introduced as an alternative to existing Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs in

three major tracks: arts therapy; music, art, and dance education; and arts performance, history, and criticism. Candidates were not only performing and visual artists interested in teaching but also individuals who aspired to administrative and curatorial positions in the arts. This shift dramatized the transformation of the creative arts model into a quasi-professional credential, for which teaching was one of several possible career paths.

Interdisciplinary model

A fourth, more interdisciplinary model was advanced in 1973 as a means of producing generalists, who could demonstrate content knowledge and technical proficiency in more than one teaching field, rather than producing subject-matter specialists. This model evolved from recommendations made by Paul Dressel, who was then director of institutional research at Michigan State University. In an evaluation of fifteen programs, Dressel criticized the disciplinary approach for its lack of curricular breadth in preparing faculty to teach undergraduate survey courses.[79] Housed in divisional, interdepartmental, or multidisciplinary subject-matter organizations to expedite cross-disciplinary expertise and to reflect the characteristics of undergraduate programs that prospective college teachers might encounter, programs of this model incorporated interdisciplinary core seminars; a campus-based practicum, a teaching internship, or an externship outside the major field; and an interdisciplinary research project or thesis.

To foster this interdisciplinary approach, in 1974 the Carnegie Corporation committed $492,000 for a competitive second and final round of fellowship awards that emphasized interdisciplinary content, interdepartmental faculty collaboration, and the use of instructional technology. One of its recipients was SUNY-Albany, whose D.A. in humanistic studies is interdisciplinary and requires work in two fields, at least one in the humanities (thirty credits) and the other in the humanities, a social science, or a professional field (eighteen credits); three interdisciplinary, team-taught core seminars; an individually designed externship; and a research essay that integrates both the major and minor subjects.[80]

At Clark Atlanta University, the only historically black institution offering the D.A., students complete twelve credit-hours in pedagogy, consisting of two internships and various courses in comparative higher education and teaching in the humanities; a twelve-credit core in humanistic inquiry, literature, and "ideas and exemplars"; a twenty-four-credit concentration in either African-American studies, English, history, or romance languages; and a thesis. The program is designed to prepare candidates to teach African-American studies with an emphasis in English, history, or foreign languages and to improve humanities education in the U.S. and Third World countries.

A more recent D.A., in modern world history offered at St. John's University since 1986, recruits teachers of history and social studies in secondary schools and

community colleges. It combines history, Asian studies, government, philosophy, sociology, and theology in an integrated curriculum (thirty-three credits); instructional methods (nine credits); a campus-based practicum (three credits); a research essay (nine credits); and qualifying and comprehensive examinations.

Professional model

The D.A. became increasingly professionalized in the 1970s, and a fifth model was promoted for experienced practitioners in government, business, engineering, education, and library science. Examples of this special-purpose D.A. are a clinical doctorate in communicative disorders (audiology and speech pathology) at Adelphi University, an administrative doctorate in library management at Simmons College, technical doctorates in civil and mechanical engineering at the University of Miami, and two education doctorates at George Mason University.

To recruit students with demonstrated competency in teaching fields, D.A. programs give less emphasis to GRE scores, foreign language proficiency, and research potential.

At George Mason University, a D.A.Ed. established in 1980 consists of individually designed programs that enable students to expand their pedagogical content knowledge across a spectrum of disciplines and fields. The program combines core courses in educational foundations (nine credits); advanced study in an individually designed education major, e.g., special education, curriculum, counseling, administration, or staff development (fifteen to eighteen credits); a liberal arts or science cognate (eighteen credits); an externship in the major field; and an innovative research project. George Mason's D.A.C.C., established in 1990 in conjunction with the twenty-three-unit Virginia Community College System, is intended for community college faculty seeking doctorates in their teaching field. It encompasses a ten-credit education core; a twenty-four-credit major in any of George Mason's departments, which include the liberal arts, business, nursing, operations research, and applied statistics; a three-credit internship in a community college, government agency, or business setting; and an independent doctoral research project.

External degree model

In response to recommendations that the D.A. serve nontraditional adult students, three nonresidential institutions with strong interests in independent learning structures adopted the degree, beginning in the mid-1970s. They were the Fielding Institute (education), Western Colorado University (teaching the humanities/social sciences), and Nova University (information sciences and teaching/learning). This model superimposed a programmatic innovation — the D.A. — on an organizational innovation — the nonresidential graduate school — when interest was strong in providing alternatives to meet the needs of adult learners. Western Colorado, for example, required completion of two semesters of individual projects, seminars, formal courses, examinations, and, for the D.A. in teaching, a project worthy of publication

(such as a textbook in the major field) or a dissertation on a problem related to undergraduate education.

Admission Criteria and Financial Aid

To recruit students with demonstrated competency in teaching fields, D.A. programs give less emphasis to GRE scores, foreign language proficiency, and research potential. Criteria for admission stress evidence of interest in teaching, relevant experience, and commitment to undergraduate teaching (or, in the case of nonteaching fields such as library management, appropriate academic and professional credentials). In the early 1970s, NDEA Title IV fellowships and Carnegie Corporation grants accelerated the time-to-completion of the D.A. degree to three years of full-time attendance. Once these funds were exhausted, however, competition intensified for scarce resources to support doctoral students, and admissions criteria were modified to permit part-time attendance, increasing the median time-to-degree to 7.8 years by 1989-91. Since then, some programs have begun to recruit adult students from outside the teaching profession who wish to change careers, while other programs have drawn their cohort from teachers in local school districts and community colleges.

Structure of the D.A. and Degree Requirements

An analysis for this monograph of thirty D.A. programs in twelve institutions indicates that total credit-hour requirements range from forty-five to sixty-three credits beyond the master's degree, distributed as follows: (1) eighteen to thirty-six credits of coursework in the major field, providing breadth of content knowledge; (2) twelve to eighteen credits in one or more related disciplines; (3) an optional core of nine to eighteen credits of professional education courses in learning theory, student development, teaching methodology, assessment, and topics in higher education; (4) zero to twelve credits in research; (4) zero to twelve credits in internships, externships, or practica; (5) written and/or oral comprehensive qualifying examinations; and (6) a dissertation or special project that demonstrates the student's ability to integrate one or more aspects of teaching, curriculum, and classroom instruction in the major field.

When asked in surveys for this monograph what had made their own program distinctive compared with "other doctorates," D.A. recipients contrasted their degree with the Ph.D. in the context of the research/teaching and specialization/generalist arguments. They identified the following distinctive features of the D.A.: the multidisciplinary focus, the professional education courses, the number of general qualifying examinations, the internship requirements, and the flexibility afforded by an applied dissertation.

Coursework

Since course requirements presume that effective teaching in a discipline derives from breadth of knowledge combined with suitable training to convey that knowledge to undergraduates, D.A. programs generally have more coursework than Ph.D. programs. Pedagogical study tends to be offered within the arts and sciences framework rather than through education departments, owing in part to the origins of the D.A. as an alternative to the Ed.D. Many D.A. programs also require candidates to complete concentrations in two or three teaching fields, at least one of which is outside their declared major. For example, the economics major at Illinois State University has sixteen concentration options, including higher education, business, marketing, organizational behavior, political science, and public policy.

When asked in surveys for this monograph what had made their own program distinctive compared with "other doctorates," D.A. recipients contrasted their degree with the Ph.D. in the context of the research/teaching and specialization/generalist arguments.

Research tools and examinations

Research courses in D.A. programs are oriented toward the pedagogy of content knowledge, evaluation and assessment of students and curricula, and the use of instructional technology as explanatory frameworks. Methodological issues relate more directly to curriculum design and assessment and the communication of knowledge and skills to undergraduates than to original research in specialized subfields of the discipline. In this context, qualifying examinations are broader than in comparable Ph.D. programs, requiring candidates to demonstrate knowledge in two or more fields and, in the teaching model, to address pedagogical as well as substantive questions.

The internship/practicum

The supervised and evaluated internship is the component that most clearly distinguishes the D.A. from the Ph.D., although it is quite common for D.A. students with teaching experience to be released from this requirement. Responses to the national survey of D.A. recipients for this monograph indicated that the number of required internships varies from one (59% of recipients) to four (2%); 19 percent of D.A. recipients obtained waivers based on their prior teaching experience, despite the fact that evaluators have frowned upon the practice. The type of internship varied, with the most common being in classroom teaching (83%), followed by curriculum development (15%), applied research (8%), performance (3%), clinical practice (1%), and supervision (1%). In his first evaluation of the D.A. for the Carnegie Corporation, Paul Dressel was highly critical of the use of teaching assistantships as a means of fulfilling internship requirements, on the grounds that they were functionally unrelated to the doctoral programs.[41]

At SUNY-Albany and the University of Michigan, candidates do externships at campuses where they have not taught previously. Other programs integrate

instructional design and evaluation experiences in order to introduce students to models of teaching and learning, assessment techniques, and practica in their major and minor fields. A third approach, at Adelphi University in speech pathology, adopts a medical model, incorporating three clinical internships in hospital, agency, and school settings. At Ball State University, music majors complete one or more supervised internships in conducting, orchestral performance, or college teaching.

The dissertation/final project

Although some programs retain a traditional dissertation, this is not the usual practice. New York State guidelines require a research essay, preferably *prior to* the internship. Respondents from the fourteen universities surveyed for this monograph variously defined their final projects as "interpretive," "analytical," "expository," "creative," and "scholarly" and characterized them as traditional dissertations (32%); curriculum theses (25%); research essays (17%); treatises (16%); educational projects (6%); or creative works, including poetry, musical compositions, sculpture, and plays (4%). A recent review of the University Microfilms record of D.A. dissertations suggests the presence of a pedagogical component in at least 41 percent of 1,189 titles and an emphasis on the teaching of composition, rhetoric, or technical writing in 114 (12%) English D.A. dissertations.[12]

Survey respondents (faculty and students) described a variety of permissible approaches to the dissertation, including investigation of a research problem, expository or historical treatment of a topic, a project in pedagogy of the discipline, or the publication of a curriculum text. These data should be considered in the light of the many changes that the traditional Ph.D. dissertation currently is undergoing: In 1990, a committee of graduate deans conducted a study of the Ph.D. dissertation and found that "precisely what constitutes a dissertation and in what forms the material may be presented vary across disciplines and among universities."[13]

Summary

In analyzing the models that evolved as the D.A. was institutionalized, it is evident that the meaning of the degree was constructed not by its proponents and adopters but by the faculty responsible for its implementation. The proponents of the D.A. merely signaled their willingness to redefine the doctorate as a practitioner-oriented degree. In the process, its purpose was expanded to encompass professional fields other than teaching, and degree components were modified to reflect this redefinition. The multipurpose nature of the degree evolved throughout the phases of its development and diffusion and ultimately gave rise to concerns regarding its overall quality and its viability as a teaching doctorate. ◆

CHAPTER 3

Diffusion and Decline

Tracing the changing status of the degree, including an analysis of statistical data.

The diffusion of the D.A. occurred in three phases between 1967 and 1990; all three phases were influenced by the expectation of Carnegie Corporation grants. During this time frame, a total of thirty-one institutions adopted the D.A. in eighty-eight departments and forty-four fields, including English (13 programs), mathematics (8), and history (8). (This data is provided in greater detail in **Table 1.**)

During the first phase, from 1967 to 1972, twenty institutions adopted the degree in forty-one departments and eighteen fields. The dominant models originating in this initial phase were curriculum, teaching, and creative arts. During the second phase, from 1973 to 1978, nineteen institutions, eight of which had already adopted the D.A. in Phase I, launched thirty-nine new programs in nineteen fields. The impetus for this surge in program growth was a Carnegie grant competition to promote innovation in the D.A. This phase introduced the interdisciplinary, professional, and external degree models and expanded those in teaching and creative arts. The third and final phase, from 1980 to 1990, was limited to six institutions and eight new programs in seven fields, further extending the utilization of professional and interdisciplinary approaches.

The professionalization of the D.A., which had begun in the mid-1970s, accelerated in the 1980s as universities sought ways to attract diverse student populations to their graduate schools and to comply with state mandates for program distinctiveness. All of the Phase III institutions, except George Mason and Nova universities, had already initiated the D.A. during Phases I and II and, in the case of those established in New York, had the added incentive of Carnegie planning grants.

Degree Production

By field

Degree production began slowly, with only 144 D.A.'s awarded in the first five years, from 1968 to 1973.[1] This number quadrupled in the next decade: 545 degrees

were granted between 1974 and 1979, and 516 between 1980 and 1985. The majority of these degree recipients benefited from Carnegie grants received by their institutions through a combination of financial aid (tuition grants, stipends, fellowships) and teaching assistantships. Since 1986, degree productivity has ranged from a low of 76 in 1987 to a high of 105 in 1991, the most recent year for which data are available. A total of 1,943 D.A. degrees were awarded by thirty-one universities between 1968 and 1991. Four public and one private universities have awarded 100 or more D.A. degrees: Carnegie Mellon (244), University of Northern Colorado (220), Middle Tennessee State University (200), Idaho State University (192), and the University of Michigan (115).

The most popular fields have been literature and letters (640), education (231), history (223), music (187), mathematics (130), and biology (122), as shown in **Table 2.** Sixty (60) percent of all D.A.'s (1,163) have been awarded in the humanities, 18 percent (343) in science and mathematics, and 7 percent (136) in the social sciences, reflecting the original purpose of preparing faculty to teach lower-division liberal arts courses. Professional fields, including education and library science, now account for 15 percent (301) of all D.A. degrees, raising questions about the meaning of the D.A. as a teaching doctorate in the liberal arts and sciences. Education specializations range from physical education and counseling to higher education and curriculum, bringing the D.A. closer in purpose to the Ed.D. degree. As the D.A. has become more professionalized, the vision of paradigmatic change has been obscured, and it has become more difficult to discern the degree's distinctive character.

By gender, race/ethnicity, and age

The participation of women in D.A. programs increased from 31 percent in 1973 to 50 percent in 1991, with the most rapid increase taking place since 1985, particularly in education, library science, the humanities, and the physical sciences. This trend parallels national data for all doctorates and, in the case of the D.A., is partly attributable to the affirmative action criteria announced in 1975 by the Carnegie Corporation for its second round of grants, which stipulated that "a sizable fraction of the funds" be allocated to fellowships for minorities and women.[9]

Minority participation has tripled, from 5.4 percent in 1973-76 to 16.6 percent in 1989-91, and African-American students account for the largest gains. In 1991, the most recent year for which data are available, whites received 85 percent of all D.A. degrees, African-Americans 11 percent, Latinos 3 percent, and Native Americans 1 percent.

The median age of graduates also rose between 1973-76 and 1989-91, from 32.8 years to 40 years, with little difference between men (from 33 to 40 years) and women (from 32.5 to 39.8 years).

Decline of the D.A.

Three of the original Carnegie Corporation grantee institutions ultimately decided not to offer the D.A. and returned their planning grants in 1970. Two of these, Dartmouth College and MIT, determined to reshape their Ph.D. programs to meet the D.A. objectives of preparation for college teaching; the third, Stephen Austin University, was prohibited from offering the D.A. by the Texas Board of Higher Education, which declared a state moratorium on new degrees. In addition, Yeshiva University reported a D.A. program in Judaic Studies but never activated it.[16]

A parallel effort to gain approval for the D.A. at the University of California at Berkeley was rejected by its faculty, who viewed the degree's research component as inadequate. The California Board of Regents also rejected a proposal to implement the D.A. in its state college system, citing an earlier master planning decision that no doctorates be approved outside the University of California system. These decisions were ironic rebuffs to Clark Kerr, a major proponent of the D.A. and one of the architects of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education during his tenure as president of the University of California.[17]

Termination of D.A. programs began at Brown University in 1976, and during the next sixteen years, nineteen institutions discontinued the D.A. in one or more fields. Between 1976 and 1992, twelve universities terminated the D.A. in *all* fields, and seven universities discontinued the degree in *some* fields; six additional universities discontinued another eighteen fields. An external D.A. was also a casualty of a college closing, when Western Colorado University, established in 1971 as a private, nonresidential university, was denied accreditation by the North Central States Association and discontinued operations in 1984.[18]

At least five of these universities — George Mason, Illinois State, Northern Colorado, SUNY-Albany, and SUNY-Stony Brook — await decisions on their applications to convert one or more D.A. programs into Ph.D.'s with teaching emphases. In Illinois, the Board of Higher Education approved a Ph.D. in mathematics education at Illinois State in 1989. In October 1992, as part of the state's "Priorities-Quality-Productivity (PQP) Initiatives," the Board recommended the elimination of the D.A. in both mathematics and economics on the grounds of insufficient demand, low degree production, and high cost relative to comparable doctorates in other Illinois institutions.[19]

At Washington State University, the department of mathematics recently approved a Ph.D. in mathematics with a teaching emphasis (Ph.D./T.E.), a name change intended to bring the D.A. into line with current usage. An explanatory statement issued by the department asserts:

> While requiring competence in core mathematics, [the Ph.D./T.E.] also requires study in the foundations of mathematics, computer science, the craft

The professionalization of the D.A., which had begun in the mid-1970s, accelerated in the 1980s as universities sought ways to attract diverse student populations to their graduate schools and to comply with state mandates for program distinctiveness.

of teaching, and advanced coursework in a discipline using mathematical applications. A full-time teaching internship and a thesis may be offered in lieu of an original piece of mathematical research as the culminating experience.

Ambivalence of faculty in research universities toward a teaching doctorate led to the withdrawal of support by many early adherents. This indifference was manifested in the responses gleaned from a series of eight national surveys of graduate deans conducted by Ball State University.[50] These surveys began in 1970 with optimistic estimates of widespread acceptance and concluded in 1988 with the recognition that the degree had peaked and minimal interest existed to foster new programs. By 1976, fifty deans responding to the Ball State survey reported changes in their Ph.D. programs to incorporate a teaching track.

In his final report to the Carnegie Corporation in 1980, Paul Dressel introduced the "thirtysomething" factor, suggesting that individuals over 30 years of age with family responsibilities who could not attend graduate school full-time should weigh personal and professional goals when deciding between a Ph.D. and a D.A. program. He cautioned that, where the two degrees coexist, the D.A. might be regarded as "second-rate," and that financial aid is more likely to go to research-oriented Ph.D. students rather than to part-time graduate students interested in teaching.[51] His pessimistic acknowledgment of the problems being encountered in the diffusion process was indicative of a change in tone on the part of D.A. adherents.

The Decision to Terminate

While a decision to institute D.A. programs originated "at the top" — in the office of the president or the graduate dean — the decision to terminate them generally was made by departmental faculty and endorsed by graduate school faculty councils. Program directors interviewed for this monograph offered seven common explanations for their decisions to terminate the D.A. in one or more departments: institutional transformation, the primacy of the Ph.D., withdrawal of external funding and support, changes in the disciplines, program quality, the collapse of the job market, and the increase in degree specialization.

Institutional transformation

Of the universities that originally adopted the D.A., 40 percent elevated their Carnegie Classification status between 1972 and 1987, as shown in **Table 3**.[52] Research I and II institutions now account for 42 percent of those institutions, Doctoral I and II institutions for 48 percent, and Comprehensive Universities for 3 percent. As formerly regional colleges such as CMU, UIC, and Lehigh University became international research universities, their motivation to prepare college teachers diminished. As one

program director observed: "We are not educationist and are now aiming at a different, more international clientele that will enable us to attract research grants and to advance the study of the discipline."

Primacy of the research doctorate

Faculty recruited to departments with D.A. programs sought to reshape the degree into a mirror image of the Ph.D., and as the academic labor market weakened in the 1970s and 1980s, the rationale for a teaching doctorate became less compelling. Increased emphasis on publications and research as a condition for promotion and tenure in liberal arts colleges as well as in universities reinforced the rationale for restoration of the traditional Ph.D. model. A dean who had been involved in the inception of the D.A. reflected that:

> The D.A. was a victim of changing times, a decline in idealism in the 1980s, a reluctance on the part of community colleges to hire faculty with any kind of doctorates, and changing attitudes among new faculty who wanted students to be clones of themselves.

Restructuring the humanities

Paradigmatic shifts in the liberal arts that influenced the structure and content of the humanities curriculum led to pressures to change the focus of the D.A. and to institute a Ph.D. option. The rejection of the old canon and its replacement by a broad spectrum of cultural studies have altered the focus and methodology of doctoral programs. This has had an inevitable impact on the D.A. A department chair in English explained that:

> Our D.A. is a powerful program with a national profile; but the Ph.D. is a more marketable credential, and we are seeking approval for a Ph.D. option. Initially, we emphasized an integrated approach to composition and literature [in our D.A.]. However, we need . . . [a] more specialized [doctoral program] to reflect changes in the field of English occurring at the national level; as a result, we are moving in other directions with new concentrations in rhetoric, critical theory, and linguistics.

Program quality

The D.A. curriculum was severely criticized for the lack of a common core of courses and the emphasis on introductory rather than advanced specialization in the teaching field — the reflection of what has become known as the "breadth versus depth" controversy. Other criticisms relate to the variable character of the internship, the replacement of the dissertation with projects and essays, and the use of the degree

for candidates who lack the motivation and ability to do research. A provost charged with the responsibility of disbanding D.A. programs observed that:

> The D.A. is symptomatic of the devaluation of degree[s] in general and the doctorate in particular. It was used as a marketing tool but compromised the research dimension of the doctorate by offering an escape hatch to those who couldn't handle the dissertation. If we candidly examine how innovations such as the D.A. are defined, it is in terms of marketing, and, in this case, the enrollment climate determines what we offer rather than our need for qualified teaching faculty.

While a decision to institute D.A. programs originated "at the top" — in the office of the president or the graduate dean — the decision to terminate them generally was made by departmental faculty and endorsed by graduate school faculty councils.

A department chair at a Western university summed it up succinctly when he observed:

> The D.A. was a noble experiment at the wrong time and perhaps the wrong institution. Its need in English had become less justifiable by the time we introduced it, with fewer teaching opportunities in the two-year colleges. We did not have enough human and material resources to support a really strong program and here, at least, we tended to attract people who couldn't manage a research Ph.D. and that hardly seemed a worthy purpose.

Withdrawal of resources

The inability of departments to sustain programs without adequate resources was cited as the determining factor in the decision to terminate D.A. programs. In the humanities, diminishing enrollment and the withdrawal of fellowship funds contributed to the decline of the D.A. In the natural sciences and mathematics, external support was more likely to sustain scientific and technological research in Ph.D. programs than to encourage undergraduate teaching.

Collapse of the academic job market

Shortly after the advent of the D.A., the availability of full-time, tenure-track faculty positions became more limited, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. The lack of opportunities for teaching in colleges and universities was a boon to business, medical, and law schools, but proved detrimental to D.A. program recruiting efforts.

Degree specialization

The increased specialization of graduate degrees was perceived as problematic in sustaining support for the more generic D.A. The Survey of Earned Doctorates now collects data from recipients of fifty-one different doctorates, including (in addition to the Ph.D., D.A., and Ed.D.) doctorates in science, fine arts, music, business, and engineering. The Ed.D., which was rejected by the Carnegie Commission in 1970 as a

marginal degree, accounted for 11 percent of all doctorates awarded through 1991. Professional doctorates have been granted legitimacy by accrediting associations that recognize them as valid terminal credentials for teaching in specialized fields. A former department chair indicated that doctorates in architecture, fine arts, and music were apt to be better understood by faculty, students, and potential employers, and — from the universities' perspective of seeking to improve their comparative advantage — would probably gain in popularity during the next decade.

Time-to-degree and degree completion

Another major factor contributing to the decline of the D.A., that is not mentioned by program directors but is evident in the national data on the D.A., is the increased time to degree completion. The Survey of Earned Doctorates uses two time measures, "total time-to-degree" (TTD) and "registered time-to-degree" (RTD) from baccalaureate to doctorate, each of which signifies different graduate school enrollment patterns.[50] The data show quite clearly that in the past three decades, RTD for all Ph.D. recipients has increased by 32 percent, and TTD has increased for all doctorate recipients by 19 percent, with "recipients in social sciences and in nonsciences [experiencing] longer time lapses than did Ph.D.'s in natural sciences."[51] Bowen and Rudenstine attribute the increased length of time to complete the Ph.D. to a decline in fellowship awards for nonscience candidates, an increase in part-time attendance by humanists and social scientists who must supplement their income with adjunct teaching positions, and higher attrition rates at the dissertation phase of the Ph.D.[52]

In the two decades for which data on the D.A. are available, TTD and RTD also have increased, but at a more rapid rate — 60 percent for TTD and 47 percent for RTD. This runs counter to a major objective of the D.A., which was to provide a nonresearch program that could be completed in three years of full-time post-baccalaureate study.

Table 4 shows the incremental rise in RTD for all D.A. recipients, from 5.3 years in 1973-76 to an all-time high of 7.8 years in 1989-91, and the corresponding increase in TTD, from 10 years to 16 years, during the same period. The fields reporting the largest increases in RTD were the physical sciences, life sciences, and education, each of which rose by 44 percent; the largest increases in TTD were in the humanities (68%) and education (70%). A comparison of these two time measures by gender indicates that RTD has increased by 53 percent for men, compared with 40 percent for women, with the greatest difference occurring in the nonsciences.

An analysis of the national survey data collected for this monograph indicates that the median TTD from baccalaureate to conferral of the D.A. is 12.9 years, and the median RTD is 7.8 years — comparable to the national data on D.A. graduates. And program directors surveyed complained that the limited availability of fellowship funds

for nonresearch programs such as the D.A. has been detrimental to their efforts to sustain student enrollments, particularly in the sciences, where the availability of research fellowships in Ph.D. programs is a powerful recruitment incentive.

When analyzed by type of institution, this sample is also representative of the almost equal distribution of research and doctoral institutions offering the D.A.: Six Research I and II institutions accounted for 49 percent of respondents, and seven Doctoral I and II institutions for 45 percent. Doctoral I and II institutions provided more financial assistance (56% compared with 38% for Research institutions) and had a relatively higher percentage of full-time students (55% compared with 39%). It can be speculated that the greater allocation of resources to students in doctoral institutions could be the result of those institutions having had few, if any, Ph.D. programs, and consequently more discretionary resources to give to D.A. students. This hypothesis is borne out by the number of survey respondents who cited financial aid as a determining factor in their decision to pursue a D.A. degree.

The D.A. has found a comfortable niche in the universities that continue to support it.

Program Trends in the 1990s

Twenty-one universities continue to offer the D.A. in thirty-three fields, as shown in **Table 5.** Fourteen of these institutions offer the degree in more than one field of study. The most frequently offered majors are English (8), history (5), mathematics (5), and chemistry (5). Eight programs are interdisciplinary (among them, modern world history, humanistic studies, international affairs, TESOL, and education). While those statistics represent a 39 percent decline in program offerings between 1970 and 1990, the D.A. has found a comfortable niche in the universities that continue to support it.

At four universities — New York University, the University of Michigan, the University of Miami, and the University of Illinois at Chicago — students may choose between the Ph.D., Ed.D., and D.A. degrees. The University of Michigan offers the D.A. in English for community college teachers, the Ed.D. in English education for secondary school teachers, and the Ph.D. in English language and literature as "the basic credential for college faculty." The D.A., in this case, combines coursework in rhetoric, composition theory, literacy, and discourse analysis with a community college internship and a dissertation in the theory and practice of teaching college English. At Miami, which originally permitted all Ph.D.-granting departments to also offer the D.A., both degrees are still offered only in English, history, and physics. Chemistry majors at UIC and Lehigh may take either a Ph.D. or a D.A. in chemistry.

Summary

Program directors concur that the D.A. has had a salutary impact by "encouraging faculty to rethink the purposes of the doctorate" and "freeing students who aspire to

teach undergraduates from the rigid requirements of the research Ph.D." One director observed that "building a program around an interdisciplinary framework was an exciting breakthrough for our graduate faculty, most of whom had rarely interacted before and who were now meeting regularly to plan seminars and work with students on their research projects." A former department chair felt that "faculty were more interested in pedagogy as a result of their involvement with the teaching of their discipline rather than [with] a narrow research problem." As programs formed enclaves within the departmental structure, faculty began to view themselves as a combination of "advisor, coach, and mentor" and to assume the role of advocates in obtaining more resources, securing internships, and mentoring dissertations. ◆

CHAPTER 4

Listening to the Graduates

Analyzing the results of a national survey of D.A. recipients.

While there are many studies of college choice behavior among undergraduates, we know very little about the factors that influence graduate students in arts and sciences to pursue academic careers. Most of the studies of student choice of graduate schools are descriptive and quantitative analyses that focus only on a single institution or program; very few have been in-depth explorations of the decision process. Such information is particularly relevant in the context of recent data analyses that predict faculty shortages in the arts and sciences in the 1990s and that express concern about the continuing decline in interest in the research doctorate among American students.[36]

The national survey of D.A. recipients reported in this monograph was designed, in part, to determine what motivated graduates to enroll in D.A. programs. Their responses have been content-analyzed and clustered into three categories that show quite clearly the institutional, personal, and environmental factors that influenced their decisions.

Institutional factors

Most respondents (59%) cited institutional factors as being decisive, and an overwhelming 40 percent of all respondents commented on the precedence given to pedagogy over specialized research. Other considerations related to the reputation of the faculty, the interdisciplinary and curriculum focus, residency requirements permitting part-time and summer attendance, home-based internships and campus practica for experienced teachers, and the absence of foreign language requirements.

Personal factors

Personal factors accounted for 24 percent of the graduates' responses, clearly reflecting the marketing strategies used by graduate schools to attract new students. Factors included the uniqueness of the D.A. program to the geographic area in which the graduates resided and worked, the availability of attractive financial aid packages, the promise of a "quick and easy credential" compared with the Ph.D., and the relative status of a liberal arts doctorate for teachers compared with an "education" (Ed.D.) degree.

Environmental factors

Sixteen (16) percent of respondents who entered a program between 1969-73 cited the publicized demand for teachers in the community colleges and four-year colleges. As the job market declined in the mid-1970s, faculty with master's degrees perceived the D.A. as a credential that would assure their job security. Students wanted a degree that was practical in its orientation toward teaching, with more subject-matter content and fewer methods courses than an Ed.D., that could be completed in less time with less stringent research requirements than could a Ph.D. (including foreign language proficiency), and that held the promise of an exciting departure from more traditional programs. For several respondents, the D.A. was the only doctorate available in their geographic area, and this convenience, as well as its flexible residency requirements, made it a feasible choice.

Several comments, excerpted from survey responses, amplify the point. A high school history teacher decided to enroll in the D.A. "after one summer on campus as part of an ongoing curriculum development project."

> Although I was interested in research, I sensed that teaching was my real strength. I felt that a D.A. could give me solid grounding in both domains but that a Ph.D. would lack any teaching emphasis. I am a teacher, not a researcher, and the D.A. is a practitioner's degree. I was interested in teaching social studies, not in pursuing research grants or in "publishing or perishing."

A mathematics professor with eight years of teaching experience said that he was attracted to the D.A. as a means of avoiding "the tedium and uncertainty of doing a Ph.D. in theoretical mathematics. Whether you are seeking the Ph.D. or the D.A., you go through the same process. The only difference I found was in the thesis, which was expository rather than theoretical."

A community college president responded:

> Partly because of pursuing a D.A. instead of a Ph.D., my career shifted from university to community college teaching and administration. I find community colleges exciting, socially relevant, and rewarding. But I do think I would be extremely disappointed with the degree had I hoped to pursue a traditional scholarly career. Especially interesting was the ambiguous response when, at one point, I decided to do another doctorate, this time a Ph.D. in English. It is clear that the academic community doesn't know how to view or value the D.A.

The D.A. was originally envisioned as a full-time, pre-service degree for liberal arts baccalaureates who aspired to academic careers in community and four-year colleges. In reality, its appeal proved to be greater for those who were already teaching in colleges and universities (as well as in secondary schools) and who could not afford

the luxury of a full-time sabbatical from their jobs for a protracted time. They sought the most direct route to the doctorate to enhance their professional status and afford them career mobility. Only 16 percent of the respondents were full-time students when they began their programs; 95 percent already held master's degrees in the field in which they pursued the D.A.

Professional Outcomes

Contrary to the perception that D.A. graduates teach only in community colleges, the majority (51%) hold positions at four-year colleges and universities; 21 percent work in community colleges and 18 percent in local school districts.

In comparing the survey data collected for this monograph with the data from the Survey of Earned Doctorates, some similarities are evident in the profile of respondents, as shown in **Table 6.** They are predominantly male, white, U.S. citizens, married, and between 40 and 49 years of age, with a median salary of $42,000. Eighty-six (86) percent received some financial aid, most frequently in the form of teaching assistantships (45%), university fellowships (40%), and loans (25%). Thirty-eight (38) percent graduated between 1969 and 1979, and 62 percent graduated between 1980 and 1991. They majored in twenty different fields, led by history (103), English (56), mathematics (40), biology (34), and education (29), a distribution that closely parallels national data on D.A. degree production by field.

Three fourths (75%) of survey respondents teach, and an additional 15 percent are school or college administrators (see **Table 7**). Contrary to the perception that D.A. graduates teach only in community colleges, the majority (51%) hold positions at four-year colleges and universities; 21 percent work in community colleges and 18 percent in local school districts. The universities that employ them include Trinity, Florida State, Penn State, and Carnegie Mellon. Ten (10) percent are employed as consultants, business executives, computer scientists, or staff developers. More than 50 percent have changed jobs since graduation (primarily as a result of enhanced upward mobility), most frequently in education, the humanities, and social sciences.

Graduates commented at length about the advantages they felt had accrued to them as a result of their participation in a D.A. program. Their observations highlight both programmatic aspects of the D.A., in terms of intellectual and personal development, and the professional outcomes, as manifested in job security and enhanced marketability. Their comments, discussed below, have been content-analyzed and that analysis is shown in **Table 8.**

Professional skills

Eighty-eight (88) percent of respondents noted an increased awareness of professional responsibilities and the rewards of good teaching, improved pedagogical content knowledge, heightened sensitivity to the needs of their students, and greater responsiveness to issues of teaching and learning. In the area of curriculum development, they were more confident about their ability to design and evaluate new

courses, to direct entire programs, and to relate content knowledge to course development. One history graduate commented: "[The D.A.] offered invaluable training in classroom skills, and I approach teaching with great self-confidence. I would argue that the D.A. is worth at least two years of full-time teaching."

An English major cited her "increased knowledge of composition theory and applications and the theoretical basis of many teaching approaches, helping me to avoid new teacher problems." A music teacher discovered new opportunities in opera performance and vocal teaching techniques, observing:

> It helped me to do a better job in preparing courses, lectures, class materials, and research for teaching, broadening my knowledge in my content area and giving me greater confidence and enthusiasm for teaching.

Respondents concurred that as a result of their D.A. experience, they now were advocates of faculty development in their own departments. As one graduate stated:

> I would recommend the D.A. to almost anyone, especially those interested in college teaching. It represents the true substance of education, in practical, more rigorous terms than many Ed.D. programs, and as a viable alternative to the traditional Ph.D.

Respondents also cited enhanced self-confidence and self-esteem and improved interpersonal and observation analysis skills. A biology professor in a liberal arts college felt "more sensitive to student needs, more qualified to teach outside my primary specialty of zoology, and more flexible and knowledgeable as a teacher."

Intellectual growth

Although the D.A. was construed as a nonresearch degree, 64 percent of the graduates felt that they had gained new skills in research applications, particularly in curriculum development, software design, textbook writing, and instructional materials preparation. "Rather than traditional scholarly research, we learned how to design a curriculum, implement instructional technology, and improve student learning. I designed and wrote an educational software series for my doctoral project."

Others commented on "improved skills [in] interpreting and analyzing data, preparing and field-testing instructional materials," "thinking and writing about teaching and learning," engaging in critical pedagogy, and doing collaborative research. While 50 percent have published two or more articles, only 10 percent have published extensively. One of the latter stated emphatically that "[The D.A.] enhanced my skills as a thinker, researcher, and writer. I have written three books, two of which have been nominated for Pulitzer Prizes in biography, and published two dozen articles." Another also felt that "the research component was fairly rigorous, and I honed my research skills

in the traditional way — by writing scholarly articles." Others felt constrained from conducting research due to their heavy teaching loads or administrative responsibilities.

Enhanced marketability

More than half (54%) of the respondents concurred that a terminal credential and greater teaching expertise, regardless of degree designation, enhanced their mobility. This was particularly true of those in community colleges and four-year colleges, but also extended to administrators and classroom teachers. Whether they had majored in the natural sciences, social sciences, or the humanities, respondents noted that the greater breadth of their studies and their multidisciplinary preparation increased their versatility and enhanced their opportunities to teach a variety of courses, making the D.A., in the words of a biologist, "an ideal training ground for teaching undergraduate science." By the same token, other students commented on their qualifications to teach specialized subfields, such as linguistics, rhetoric, and expository writing. An English major commented that "the dual emphasis of my studies, a major in rhetoric and composition and a minor in reading, [has] enhanced my ability to get a position as director of a university writing center and has led to many job offers."

Job security

Half (51%) of the respondents cited such positive outcomes as eligibility for promotion and tenure, mobility from part-time to full-time positions, and increased salary and benefits. The graduate of a humanities program stated that "the breadth of my D.A. was a great plus — essential in obtaining a very good job teaching interdisciplinary studies in a nontraditional college." Others felt that the issue of job security was related more closely to the field and the institution in which they worked than to the kind of degree they had received. Graduates of a program in foreign language instruction thought the D.A. enhanced their marketability, secured their positions, and led to promotion and tenure. An original objective of the degree was to encourage the recruitment of D.A.'s by universities as well as community colleges; however, the reality proved quite different for secondary school teachers, several of whom recounted insuperable obstacles in gaining access to college teaching positions, but felt compensated by their ability to move up on the salary scale and to achieve status within their school districts.

Participant Satisfaction

Most D.A. recipients were highly satisfied with their degree, and in fact, 63 percent said they would definitely enroll in a D.A. program again. As one graduate stated: "I experienced professional growth, stimulating classes, enthusiastic classmates, good reading, interesting assignments, and [I] recharged my batteries."

The remaining 37 percent were more ambivalent (of those, 10% said they would definitely not enroll again). One history teacher commented:

> The D.A. was reminiscent of my M.A.T. completed a decade earlier, in which we were told we were part of an effort to pull education up by its bootstraps — and we believed it! But now, I look back and feel [that] both the D.A. and the M.A.T. were phases, and we have too little to show for it.

Most D.A. recipients were highly satisfied with their degree, and in fact, 63 percent said they would definitely enroll in a D.A. program again. The remaining 37 percent were more ambivalent (of those, 10% said they would definitely not enroll again).

The respondents were more cautious about recommending the degree to others, however. Half (51%) said they would definitely encourage colleagues and students to enroll in a D.A. program; 28 percent said it would depend on the goals of the student, the program that was selected, and the prospects for employment; and 21 percent said they would not recommend the degree to colleagues or friends. This ambivalence is evident in the observations of one graduate:

> Although the D.A. concept makes sense, I would not advise a doctoral candidate on the basis of type of degree pattern. Rather, a person simply wanting an employment credential should pursue the quickest, easiest degree path, regardless of type. Those who wish a really invigorating learning experience should go where there are professors with whom they can work closely enough to really "dig into the field" and students from whom they can learn.

For the most part, those who are employed in teaching institutions have not found the D.A. detrimental to their careers. The statement was repeatedly made that "my college regards the D.A. the same as other doctorates." A graduate employed by the department that granted his degree said, "Once launched professionally, a person finds that a D.A. or a Ph.D. is a minor distinction." Recipients who expressed dissatisfaction with the degree offered several reasons:

Lack of acceptance of alternative doctorates

Some recipients referred to the D.A. as a "fad degree that is now out of fashion," and cited difficulty in gaining adequate professional recognition as a source of frustration. Some respondents also expressed resentment about the degree's "inferior status," although the D.A. was, as one graduate put it, "as much work as the Ph.D., but minus the equivalent rewards." Another individual who decided to obtain a Ph.D. in education proclaimed, "I got tired of always having to explain my program and to prove my worth to those in Ph.D. programs." Others found it easier to record their degree as a "doctorate" and to call themselves "Dr." to avoid having to explain the meaning of the initials "D.A." The degree was sometimes described as a "consolation prize" for weaker students or a "community college degree." In a research university maintaining parallel Ph.D. and D.A. programs in science and mathematics, a chemistry major observed that

"most faculty members resented the D.A. because it siphoned off graduate students from their labs and they felt that the de-emphasis on research gave a negative image to a university striving for national prestige and recognition." As a graduate in biology stated, "In a system run by Ph.D.'s, any degree other than theirs, except for law and medicine, seems to be perceived as a practitioner's degree — less rigorous in acquisition and less valuable in attainment."

Inadequate preparation for research positions

As research became the *sine qua non* for tenure-track appointments in the 1980s, those D.A. recipients who sought to change positions saw their options limited to community colleges and less-selective four-year colleges. In universities in which research and publications are factors in promotion and tenure decisions, D.A. recipients tend to see the degree as a handicap: "There is a fair amount of prejudice toward the D.A. in the academic marketplace. Universities with doctoral programs want faculty who have demonstrated research potential and will enhance the prestige of their departments." Where research is a factor, the degree is considered "less than the Ph.D." or "unacceptable as a terminal degree for promotion purposes." One respondent stated: "I was intimidated by the Ph.D. dissertation requirement; but the D.A. concept has not caught on, and we are still being held to the same standards of research and publication." Others blame their research deficiencies on the D.A. As one faculty member said:

> The emphasis on teaching was useful, but the scholarly research component was inadequate. D.A. requirements and standards need to be tightened and both qualitative and quantitative research made part of all programs. The renewed interest in instructional quality makes the precepts of the D.A. more appealing; but if the emphasis continues to be on publishing and research, the D.A. doesn't stand a chance in the job market.

In the corporate world, where teaching and research are not issues, the D.A. is viewed as "an earned doctorate and no different than a Ph.D." A staff developer in a federal agency responded, "They respect the degree and the title, although a Ph.D. would be easier to explain. I usually refer to it as 'my doctorate' to get around the problem." Others indicated that in business, they were judged more closely on their technical skills, in contrast to academic institutions, where the distinctions related more to institutional mission, departmental attitudes, and professional roles.

Dominance of specialized doctorates

The proliferation of specialized doctorates in professional fields also has affected D.A. graduates, who find themselves with a credential that is poorly understood. This perception echoes the feelings expressed by faculty as a possible reason for the decline in

support of the D.A. As one respondent observed, "Obtaining a credential that is not the norm for one's field can be a handicap." A music graduate said he would have opted for the Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.), in which the emphasis is on performance: "Colleges want performers who teach, not teachers who perform, and the D.M.A. is better understood." Another would have pursued a Ph.D. in musicology, which would have given "greater professional recognition and respect." A general feeling was expressed that "the market is so bad that any degree not in the mainstream hurts unless you are [a member of] a protected class; only then does a D.A. make good sense."

Programs seeking reregistration as Ph.D. or Ed.D.

Changes in degree designation by universities that have replaced the D.A. with the Ph.D. or Ed.D. have become a major issue, prompting one individual to write, "I feel betrayed now that my university has dumped the program; I fear that this has hurt my career mobility." Other graduates supported the idea of redesignation and, in some cases, sought to have their own degree designations changed to acknowledge that "our D.A. is on a par with Ph.D. programs in English; but because most academics do not understand the degree, they assign it less prestige." A faculty member teaching at a comprehensive university in the Midwest summed up the feelings expressed by others when she wrote:

> I would recommend the D.A. only to those who are committed to teaching at a small college and not a large research university, with the caveat that they go to one of the strongest schools offering the degree. Competition and research demands at large universities put the D.A. at a disadvantage, especially if teaching is really the preferred activity.

Summary

The observations of D.A. graduates illuminate our understanding of the degree's impact on their professional lives. A combination of academic, personal, and vocational factors influenced their decision to choose the D.A. In retrospect, they appear to be rather secure in their careers, having gained the requisite skills and knowledge they sought in terms of intellectual growth, pedagogical mastery, greater mobility, and vocational confidence. Their level of satisfaction is high, and fully two thirds of the respondents indicated that they would make similar choices today. The ambivalent responses expressed by one third of the respondents reflect societal norms toward the doctorate and the continuing dominance of the Ph.D. ◆

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

Offering some observations about doctoral reform and the current climate.

The study described in this monograph documents the diffusion of a well-funded innovation in higher education: the establishment and dissemination of the Doctor of Arts, a new doctorate designed to improve college teaching. A total of $3.2 million was spent between 1967 and 1976 — not including federal and university subventions — to accomplish this goal. The D.A. signified a willingness on the part of the academic establishment to examine entrenched policies and to generate blueprints for reform. Despite the rhetoric that accompanied its advent, the degree did not achieve widespread acceptance as an alternative to either the Ph.D. or its lesser-known analogue, the Ed.D. However, an assessment of the outcomes of the experiment suggests several important findings about both the acceptability and the efficacy of the teaching doctorate.

The D.A. has by and large proven to be a useful degree for its recipients. It has met their objectives as a practical program combining subject-matter content and pedagogical skills, providing them with a professional credential to enhance their careers in college teaching. It continues to flourish in twenty-one universities, in forty-seven departments and thirty fields, producing more than 100 graduates each year. These graduates, whose interests are not addressed by current Ph.D. models, credit the D.A. with their success as college teachers in fields ranging from English and history to mathematics and zoology. Graduates of professional programs also attribute their career advancement to the rigorous academic experiences completed as part of their degrees. The dedication of these highly motivated men and women is evident in their responses to the national survey undertaken for this study and in no way seems different from what one might expect to hear from comparable Ph.D.'s. What concerns they do express relate to others' perceptions of their degree, and their own need to prove themselves to gain acceptance within the academic community.

Although almost 2,000 D.A.'s have been awarded and three fourths of the recipients are teaching in schools, colleges, and universities, the D.A. has had a minimal impact on graduate education. One is hard-pressed to find any reference to it in the reform literature on either teaching and learning or the arts and sciences doctorate. A

review of the literature on educational innovation, however, reveals a long list of well-funded proposals that were generated with great fanfare but quickly lost their base of support. While the difficulty of implementing academic reforms has been well-documented in the evaluation of K-12 and undergraduate education, the consequences and ramifications of policy innovation in graduate education are less commonly studied.[7]

The D.A. signified a willingness on the part of the academic establishment to examine entrenched policies and to generate blueprints for reform.

There is no evidence that Boyer, Bok, or other current advocates for improving the quality of college teaching have seriously examined the D.A. experience, either through discussions with faculty and graduates or through an analysis of program structure, content, and outcomes. Boyer's recent report, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, takes the view that "teaching versus research" is not a dichotomy but a "tired old debate," and that a new definition of scholarship will resolve the issues inherent in that debate. He dismisses the D.A. in one sentence as an undesirable "two-track approach," arguing that "the graduate program should change, not the degree."[8] Bok's sixteen-step approach to faculty development begins with the assumption that leadership will come from Harvard rather than from universities in which undergraduate teaching is an integral part of the institutional culture. Neither Boyer's advocacy of the scholarship of teaching nor Bok's formulations for training graduate students as junior faculty adequately addresses an extremely complex issue: the paradigmatic conflict between research and teaching. A resolution will occur not through better faculty-development programs in research universities or changes in promotion and tenure policies to give greater recognition to teaching but through a more fundamental restructuring of higher education.

On a theoretical level, the lessons of the D.A. experience should be analyzed within the context of the belief system of academic life. In his book *The Reflective Practitioner*, Donald Schön argues persuasively that:

> A model of technical rationality is embedded in the institutional context of professional life [and] is implicit in the institutionalized relations of research and practice, and in the normative curricula of professional education. Even when practitioners, educators, and researchers question the model of technical rationality, they are party to the institutions that perpetuate it.[9]

A defining characteristic of the modern university — one that is embedded in the institutional context of academic life — is the research doctorate as signified by the Ph.D. The D.A., on the other hand, represents an alternative model in which practice is elevated to a higher position than research; as such, it is incompatible with Schön's model of technical rationality, which so clearly dominates the institutional context of the university. This partially accounts for the lack of receptivity toward the D.A. by graduate faculty and deans intent on protecting the status and prestige of their

institutions and using scarce resources to build national reputations as doctoral-granting research institutions.

As the developers of the D.A. are quick to point out, it was their enthusiasm for the degree and their ability to involve faculty in planning the programs and teaching the courses that contributed to the success of their graduates. However, the motivation to support the D.A. was the result of external mandates sugar-coated with promises of planning grants, fellowship awards, and more FTEs. Once the change agents — in this case, the Carnegie Corporation and the state coordinating boards — withdrew their expressed support and market forces called into question the demand for college teachers, D.A. programs lost academic legitimacy within the educational establishment.

The D.A. degree became a casualty of the conflict between teaching and research, theory and practice, undergraduate and graduate education. As long as we sustain a hierarchy of degrees in which every credential is measured against the Ph.D., attempts to transform the doctorate will not succeed.

The professionalization of the D.A., a process that began in the mid-1970s, weakened its basic premise as a teaching doctorate. As the degree assumed multiple purposes, its original rationale became increasingly ambiguous. By 1980, the curriculum model was no longer viable, the creative arts model had been professionalized into an administrative or teaching credential, and the external degree model was limited to one program option in a nonteaching field. The decline of the D.A. as "the standard nonresearch degree for college teachers" was influenced by several contextual factors that were not adequately considered at the outset by its proponents; but, from the perspective of the graduates, these factors significantly affected the value of their degree.

The overwhelming surplus of Ph.D. recipients, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, also has been a major factor leading to the decline of the D.A. As Bowen and Sosa point out, arts and sciences enrollments declined by 14 percent between 1977 and 1987 while faculties grew by 16 percent. This figure does not include the estimated 39,000 holders of doctorates who now work outside the academy, or those who are able to obtain only part-time employment.[9] Further, only 11 percent of all Ph.D.'s are now awarded in the humanities.

In addition to the collapse of the academic job market, other external influences contributing to the decline of the D.A. include the reexamination of university missions and consequent "downsizing" of graduate programs under the aegis of state coordinating boards; demographic shifts in student population and renewed demands for curricular relevance; and the increased support of business and industry for university research, particularly in science and high technology. Internal influences include the transformation of regional teaching institutions into international research universities, the competition among these universities for scarce federal resources, the entrenchment of a reward system that values research and publications more than teaching, and the collapse of consensus about the meaning of the liberal arts.

Program directors and deans surveyed for this monograph cited numerous

reasons for their decisions to discontinue the D.A.: the lack of faculty support, particularly among junior faculty not involved in the early stages of implementation; changes in administrative leadership; the removal of external sanctions restricting the number of Ph.D. programs; dissatisfaction with the quality of student work; and low degree productivity. The decision to discontinue the D.A. generally emanates from the faculty within each department, although in a few instances, termination has resulted from a recommendation of independent faculty review committees, central administration, or state coordinating boards. This is in marked contrast to the degree's introduction, which tended to be a top-down process boosted with incentives in the form of planning grants or fellowship assistance from the Carnegie Corporation.

Graduates, on the other hand, attribute the decline of the D.A. to the dominance of the Ph.D., the increased specialization of the doctorate, the perception among faculty and deans that alternative degrees were "second-rate," and the resurgence of the teaching-learning movement within research universities. This movement is manifested in the 1990s through the formation of institutions and agencies to foster new standards for evaluating the quality of faculty teaching; the sponsorship of national conferences on teaching and learning; the initiation of mandatory teacher-assistant training programs in prestigious universities; and the dissemination of materials to improve classroom assessment.

In a culture that trades in degrees as social currency, a university's prestige and status are enhanced by the quality of its doctoral programs. This is evident in the attention paid to reputation rankings in the liberal arts and sciences as well as the professions. The D.A. was a manifestation of the "academic revolution" of the 1960s and 1970s, a utilitarian degree that flourished in institutional cultures that valued undergraduate teaching. Its greatest successes were realized in Doctoral I and II universities that were relatively unencumbered by a strong commitment to the Ph.D. As teaching institutions crossed the threshold into international research and scholarship, however, the motivation to offer alternative degrees diminished.[9] The lack of recognition accorded the D.A. by advocates of the revived "teaching-learning movement" is resented by D.A. recipients who comment that:

> Once again, the wheel is being reinvented by D.A.-like programs within research universities that rejected the D.A. concept from the start. In the ideal world, degree designations matter less than skills and abilities; but in the real world, this is not the case.

The dichotomy between those who teach and those who do research remains to be resolved on both the theoretical and the practical levels. The D.A. degree became a casualty of the conflict between teaching and research, theory and practice, undergraduate and graduate education. As long as we sustain a hierarchy of degrees in

which every credential is measured against the Ph.D., attempts to transform the doctorate will not succeed. It is evident from the statements of D.A. graduates that many of them felt they were defined by others in terms of their degree, making it necessary for them to "prove themselves" to gain acceptance and respect within the academic profession.

The students, faculty, and deans who participated in this experiment in graduate education perceived the degree differently from the policymakers who proposed and supported it. While D.A. graduates are relatively satisfied with their academic experiences, the general perception of the D.A., its uncertain place in the degree hierarchy, renewed interest in college teaching that diminishes its relevance, and the continued dominance of the research Ph.D. inhibit the growth of the D.A. and threaten its survival. Faculty are not willing to support what they consider to be a marginal, misunderstood, and less-prestigious doctorate at a time when the academic labor market is once again in a retrenchment mode and the reputation and financial rewards that accrue to graduate schools and their faculties are derived from alliances with business, industry, and government agencies interested in research.

The enclaves formed by departments offering the D.A. should be tapped for their expertise in preparing college teachers, and the lessons they have learned should be integrated into the knowledge base of the teaching-learning movement.

Where the D.A. prospers, it occupies a market niche compatible with the institutional culture, one that values and rewards classroom teaching, and in which multidisciplinary and critical approaches to teaching are stressed. The effort to broaden the definition of graduate education in terms of teaching outcomes has encouraged faculty to rethink how multidisciplinary approaches to learning can be communicated more effectively to undergraduates. It has taken them beyond the argument that new faculty learn their craft in the classroom to involvement in the design of strategies that will enhance and foster their pedagogical knowledge. The D.A. experience can serve a legitimate function in the current crusade to strengthen the teaching preparation of doctoral candidates. The enclaves formed by departments offering the D.A. should be tapped for their expertise in preparing college teachers, and the lessons they have learned should be integrated into the knowledge base of the teaching-learning movement. It is feasible to incorporate pedagogical elements of D.A. programs into Ph.D. programs, and at the same time recognize that the efficacy and acceptability of the teaching doctorate will depend on the willingness of the academic establishment to move beyond the dichotomy of research and teaching to an integration of functions that is more responsive to the needs of its students. ◆

Table 1. Phases of Development and Discontinuance of the D.A., by Institution, Field, and Year, 1967-1990.

PHASE I

Year Adopted	Institution	Field	Year Discontinued
1967	Carnegie Mellon	English	1988
		Fine Arts	1976
		History	1988
		Mathematics	Inactive
1969	Oregon	English	1989
1970	Claremont Graduate School	Botany	1980
		French	1976
		Government	1980
	Middle Tennessee State	English	Active
		History	Active
		Phys. Educ./Rec.	Active
	Mississippi	Music	Active
	North Dakota	Biology	Active
		History	Active
	Northern Colorado	Botany	1989
		Chemistry	1989
		Geography	1989
		History	1989
		Mathematics	1989
	University of the Pacific	English	1980
	Washington	Germanics	1985
1971	Ball State	Music	Active
	Brown	Writing	1976
	Catholic	English	1989
	Idaho State	Biology	Active
		English	Active
		Politics	Active
		Mathematics	Active
	Lehigh	Econ./Business	1980
		Government	1987
	Ohio State	Slavic	1980
	SUNY Albany	English	Active
		Economics	1976
	Michigan	English	Active
	Mississippi	English	Active
		Politics	Active
1972	Catholic	Medical Tech.	1989
	Drake	English	1985
	Ohio State	Economics	1981
	Syracuse	English	1981
	Washington State	Chemistry	1979

cont.

Table 1 continued.

PHASE II

Year Adopted	Institution	Field	Year Discontinued
1973	Catholic	Spanish	1989
		History	1989
	Washington	Chemistry	1985
		Physics	1985
	Univ. of Miami	Chemistry	1983
		Civil Engineering	Active
		Economics	1988
		Education	1976
		English	Active
		History	Active
		Int'l Studies	Active
		Interamerican Affairs	Active
		Spanish	1988
		Mech. Engineering	Active
		Physics	Active
	Simmons	Library Science	Active
	Illinois at Chicago	Chemistry	Active
		Mathematics	Active
	Washington State	Mathematics	1980
	Mississippi	Chemistry	Active
1974	Carnegie Mellon	Chemistry	1976
	Illinois at Chicago	Physics	1989
	Illinois State	Economics	1992
		History	Active
		Mathematics	1992
1975	Lehigh	Chemistry	Inactive
	Northern Colorado	Music	Active
	Clark Atlanta	Chemistry	Inactive
1976	Illinois at Chicago	Biology	Active
	Illinois State	English	Active
	Northern Colorado	History	1989
		Mathematics	1989
	Adelphi	Speech Pathology	Active
	Fielding Institute	Education	n/a
	Western Colorado	Teaching	1984
1977	Syracuse	Foreign Languages	Active
	New York	Arts Professions	Active
1978	St. John's	English	Active
	SUNY Stony Brook	Foreign Languages	Active

cont.

Table 1 continued.

PHASE III

Year Adopted	Institution	Field	Year Discontinued
1980	George Mason	Education	Active
1981	Clark Atlanta	Humanities	Active
1983	Adelphi	Mathematics	Active
	Nova	Info. Science Teach/Learn	Active 1990
1984	SUNY Albany	Humanistic Studies	Active
1986	St. John's	World History	Active
1990	George Mason	Comm. Colleges	Active

Sources: National Survey of Doctor of Arts Degree Recipients, Spring 1991; Paul Dressel and Mary M. Thompson, *College Teaching: Improvement by Degrees* (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1974).

Table 2. D.A. Degrees Awarded in 31 Universities, by Field, 1968-1991.*

	Field	Number of Programs	Number of Degrees Awarded
Humanities (60%)	Literature/Letters	13	640
	Fine Arts	2	22
	Foreign Languages	6	50
	History	8	223
	Humanities	2	30
	Linguistics	n.a**	11
	Music	3	187
			1,163
Science/Mathematics (18%)	Biology	5	122
	Chemistry	6	40
	Computer Science	1	19
	Engineering	2	13
	Health Science	1	15
	Mathematics	8	130
	Physics	3	4
			343
Professional (15%)	Business	1	3
	Communications	n.a	4
	Education	4	231
	Library Science	1	52
	Speech Pathology	1	11
			301
Social Sciences (7%)	Area Studies	2	6
	Economics	4	29
	Geography	1	22
	Political Science	4	69
	Psychology	1	7
	Social Science	n.a	3
			136
Total Number of Degrees			1,943

* These data do not include Fielding Institute and Western Colorado University.
** "n.a." signifies data not available as reported by the Survey of Earned Doctorates.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates, unpublished data tapes, 1973-1991 data; Paul Dressel and Mary M. Thompson, *College Teaching: Improvement by Degrees* (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1974), 1968-1972 data.

Table 3. Distribution of D.A. Institutions, by Carnegie Classification, 1972 v. 1987.

Classification Type	1972	1987
Research I, II	38%	42%
Doctoral I, II	34	48
Comprehensive	22	3
Liberal Arts	3	0
Other	4	7
	100%	100%

Source: *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1973 and 1987).

Table 4. Median Number of Years to Degree for D.A. Recipients, 1973-1991.

Measure	1973-76	1977-80	1981-84	1985-88	1989-91
Registered Time to Degree (RTD)	5.3	6.3	6.8	6.9	7.8
Total Time to Degree (TTD)	10.0	12.1	13.8	14.5	16.0

Source: Survey of Earned Doctorates, unpublished data tapes.

Table 5. D.A.-Granting Institutions and Programs, as of 1991.

Institution	Field
Adelphi	Communicative Disorders Mathematics
Ball State	Music
Clark Atlanta	Chemistry Humanities (African American Studies, History, Spanish)
George Mason	Community College Education Education (D.A.Ed.)
Idaho State	Biology English Mathematics Political Science
Illinois State	Economics English History Mathematics
Lehigh	Chemistry
Middle Tennessee State	Chemistry Economics English History Physical Education
New York	Art Education Arts Therapy Arts Administration Arts and Humanities Dance and Dance Education Music and Music Education Music Performance and Composition Music Therapy Studio Art
Nova	Information Science
Simmons	Library Administration
St. John's	English Modern World History
SUNY Albany	English Humanistic Studies
SUNY Stony Brook	Foreign Language Instruction (French, Italian, German, Russian, Spanish) TESOL
Syracuse	Foreign Language and Literature
Illinois at Chicago	Biology Chemistry Mathematics

cont

Table 5 continued.

Institution	Field
Univ. of Miami	Civil Engineering English History Interamerican Studies International Affairs Mathematics Mechanical Engineering
Michigan	English
Mississippi	Chemistry English Music
Northern Colorado	Music
North Dakota	Biology History

Sources: National Survey of D.A.-Granting Universities, Spring 1991; Survey of Earned Doctorates, unpublished data tapes, 1990.

Table 6. Respondent Profiles for Two Surveys of D.A. Recipients.

		National Survey* (N=336)	Survey of Earned Doctorates** (N=1854)
Gender	Male	64%	62%
	Female	36	38
Marital Status	Married	72%	67%
	Unmarried	27	29
	Unknown	3	4
U.S. Citizen		97%	88%
Median Age	Male	46 yrs.	36 yrs.
	Female	49	38
Race/Ethnicity	White	75%	88%
	Black	6	6
	Hispanic	3	3
	Asian	2	3
	Native American	—	<1
	Unknown	14	—

* At time of survey.
** At time of degree.

Sources: National Survey of Doctor of Arts Degree Recipients, Spring 1991; Survey of Earned Doctorates, unpublished data tapes, 1973-1991.

Table 7. Employment Status of Survey Respondents, by Degree Field.

Degree Field	Changed Jobs After D.A.	Current Employer			Current Position		
		College/ University*	School District	Other	Teaching	Administration	Other
English	46%	77%	11%	12%	81%	14%	5%
History	63	61	24	15	59	26	15
Biology/ Chemistry	54	97	3	—	92	8	—
Mathematics	40	93	—	7	88	8	4
Foreign Language	47	53	41	6	94	—	6
Fine Arts	50	68	14	18	68	5	27
Education/Speech	67	26	56	18	63	19	18
Social Sciences	65	91	9	—	70	22	8
Humanities	29	100	—	—	100	—	—
Engineering	33	67	—	33	67	—	33
Total	51%	72%	18%	10%	75%	15%	10%

* Includes community colleges.

Source: National Survey of Doctor of Arts Degree Recipients, Spring 1991.

Table 8. Outcomes of Participation in a D.A. Program (N = 325).

Categories	Percentage Responding Positively*
1. Improved teaching skills	**88%**
Awareness of responsibilities	
Sensitivity to needs of students	
Familiarity with teaching methods	
Understanding of new educational technologies	
Relationship of content knowledge to course design	
Responsiveness to issues of teaching and learning	
Communication skills development	
Curriculum development and supervision	
Enhancement of self confidence and self esteem	
Observational analysis skills	
Faculty development strategies	
2. Ability to conduct research	**64%**
Interpretation and analysis of data	
Textbook development	
Collaborative research projects	
Book reviews and editing anthologies	
Critical pedagogy	
Thinking and writing about teaching and learning	
Curriculum guides	
Software program development	
Applications of research in instructional materials	
3. Enhanced marketability	**54%**
Multidisciplinary preparation increased versatility	
Terminal credential enhanced mobility	
Appropriate for community colleges, four year colleges	
Opportunities in specialized subfields	
Greater teaching expertise	
4. Increased job security	**51%**
Relationship to institutional type, e.g., schools, teaching institutions	
Eligibility for promotion and tenure	
From part time to full time employment	
Increased salary and benefits	

*Percentages not cumulative.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Criticism of the Ph.D. paralleled the rise of the research university, with the concurrent convergence of the doctorate as the definitive credential for career advancement in the academic profession. Early critics included William James ("The Ph.D. Octopus," Writings, 1902-1910 [New York: Library of America, 1987], 1101-1113); Jacques Barzun (*Teacher in America* [Boston: Meador Press, 1945]); and Bernard Berelson (*Graduate Education in the United States* [New York: McGraw Hill, 1960]).

2. In a symposium at Bowdoin College, Cartter raised several issues about the wisdom of small liberal arts colleges expanding their mission into doctoral education, citing Office of Education projections that 60,000 Ph.D.'s would be produced by 1985 but only about 45 percent of them would enter college teaching. See Alan Cartter, "Discussion of the Berelsonian Heresy," in *The Development of Doctoral Programs by the Small Liberal Arts College* (Brunswick, Maine: Bowdoin College, 1967), 67-86.

3. William G. Bowen and Julie Ann Sosa, *Future Prospects for Graduate Arts and Sciences: A Study of Factors Affecting Demand and Supply, 1987 to 2012* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989). The authors estimate that the nation will have to increase the overall production of doctorates by two thirds by the end of the 1990s to meet the anticipated demand for faculty members during the next twenty-five years. In a subsequent study, William G. Bowen and Neil L. Rudenstine (*In Pursuit of the Ph.D.* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992]) recommend several reforms to strengthen doctoral education in the arts and sciences and to raise the quality of the professoriate.

4. See James Fairweather, "Teaching and the Faculty Reward Structure" (Paper presented at the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, University Park, Pa., 1992). This recent analysis of data on the compensation of full-time, tenure-track faculty from four-year institutions finds that, in most cases, teaching productivity is not rewarded to the same extent as research and scholarship. A national survey conducted by Alexander Astin, William Korn, and Eric Dey (*The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey* [Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1991]) reports that nine out of ten faculty cite teaching as their primary activity, while 28 percent claim to be more interested

and engaged in research; 27 percent feel that institutional demands for research interfere with their ability to teach effectively.

5. Ernest Boyer, author of *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990) proposes that the work of the professoriate be redefined into four overlapping spheres — the scholarships of discovery, integration, application, and teaching — and that faculty be rewarded for their contributions as teacher-scholars.

6. See Derek Bok, "The Improvement of Teaching," *Teachers College Record* 93, no.2 (Winter 1991): 237-251. The author's emphasis on supervised preparatory training for graduate teaching fellows (pp. 240-242) is strongly reminiscent of the teaching model implemented by D.A. programs in the 1970s.

7. The relevance of these questions is underscored in the priorities for the 1993 annual grants competition of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), which invites proposals to "improve the preparation for teaching of Ph.D. candidates bound for college teaching careers" and to "illuminate the issue of whether college faculty should be trained in generic or in discipline-specific programs" (*Applications for Grants Under the Comprehensive Program*, 12). In 1975, FIPSE also called for proposals to "elevate the importance of teaching," indicating the persistence of this policy issue.

8. Special data sets for the years 1973-1991 were provided in four-year aggregates by Dolores Thurgood and Julie Clarke, Doctorate Records Project, *Survey of Earned Doctorates*, sponsored by five federal agencies (National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Education, National Endowment for the Humanities, and U.S. Department of Agriculture) and conducted by the National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

Chapter 1

9. The recommendation was made by Wallace Atwood, president of Clark University, in response to a paper by John P. Johnston ("The Integration of the Upper Division of the American College and the Graduate School," in *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Conference* [Washington, D.C.: Association of American Universities, 1932]: 163-164). In a survey of AAU-member institutions, Edward J. Baxter ("The Teaching Ph.D.," *Educational Record* 20 [January 1939]: 107-117) points out that the "1927-30 debate" signaled "the beginning of a gradual but definite course of action" to institute professional training for prospective college teachers.

10. See Edwin Moise, "The Proposed Doctor of Arts Degree," *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 8 (April 1961): 112-115. In 1935, a commission of the

Mathematical Association concluded that a second type of doctorate would be desirable and recommended the inauguration of a three-year graduate curriculum leading to the Doctor of Mathematics; see Commission on the Training and Utilization of Advanced Students of Mathematics, "Report on the Training of Teachers of Mathematics," *The American Mathematical Monthly* 42 (May 1935): 269.

11. Oliver C. Carmichael, *Graduate Education in America: A Critique and a Program* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1961).

12. See Erwin R. Steinberg, *Needed Research in the Teaching of English: Proceedings of a Project English Research Conference* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963): 119.

13. See Don Cameron Allen, *The Ph.D. in English and American Literature* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968); Roy F. Nichols, "A Reconsideration of the Ph.D.," *The Graduate Journal* 7 (Spring 1967): 325-335. For an in-depth review of the origins of the D.A. and its development in English literature, see Jo Anne K. Hecker, "The Doctor of Arts Degree in Four Departments of English: An Innovation in Graduate Education" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1978).

14. See Fredson Bowers, "The Doctor of Arts: A New Graduate Degree," *College English* 27 (November 1965): 123-128; Terry O'Banion, *Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College* (Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1973); Lucian S. Pugliaresi, *Inquiries Into a New Degree: A Candidate in Philosophy*, Paper P-13 (Berkeley, Calif.: Office of the Vice President-Planning and Analysis, University of California, 1970).

15. Stephen Spurr, *Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States* (Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1970), 140.

16. See E. Alden Dunham, *Colleges for Forgotten Americans: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities* (Hightstown, N.J.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1969); Paul Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, *Blueprint for Change: Doctoral Programs for College Teachers* (Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1972).

17. During two site visits to Carnegie Mellon in 1989 and 1990, interviews were conducted and archival data reviewed. Two individuals in particular — Ted Fenton, professor of history, and Erwin Steinberg, professor of English and former dean of the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences — were instrumental in the advent of the D.A. Their involvement in NDEA-funded curriculum projects in social studies and English, beginning in 1959, convinced them of the need to involve high school teachers as curriculum

developers (Ted Fenton, interviews with author, Pittsburgh, Pa., 23 December 1989 and 28 October 1990).

18. Clark Kerr, "Preface" in Dunham, *Colleges for Forgotten Americans.*

19. Recommendations for adoption of the D.A. were incorporated into several Carnegie Commission reports, especially *Less Time, More Options* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1972); *More Effective Use of Resources* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971); and *Reform On Campus* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1972). Another Commission-sponsored study, however, revealed little interest in a "new teaching doctorate" and stated that forecasts of a surplus of college teachers were "likely to foreclose widespread adoption of special doctorates" (Lewis B. Mayhew, *Graduate and Professional Education, 1980* [New York: McGraw Hill, 1970], 29).

20. See Dunham, *Colleges for Forgotten Americans.*

21. E. Alden Dunham, "Rx for Higher Education: The Doctor of Arts Degree," *Journal of Higher Education* 41 (October 1970): 506.

22. Ibid., 512.

23. Ibid.

24. Council of Graduate Schools, *The Doctor of Arts Degree* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1970); American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *The Doctor of Arts Degree: A Proposal for Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1970); National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *Guidelines for the Preparation of Community/Junior College Teachers* (Washington, D.C.: National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1968).

25. Council of Graduate Schools, 2.

26. Council of Graduate Schools, *Supplemental Statement on the Doctor of Arts Degree* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1972), 1-9.

27. Ibid., 10.

28. See Doctoral Evaluation Project, "Guidelines for Structuring the Doctor of Arts (D.A.) Degree" (Albany, N.Y.: State Education Department, 1976). Adopted by the New York Board of Regents, Albany, N.Y., 26 September 1975, and amended 29 June 1976.

29. Mary Martin (dean at Middle Tennessee State University), interview with author, Pocatello, Idaho, 5 October 1989. As part of the Stipulation of Settlement in a statewide desegregation suit (Geier v. McWhirter), the Tennessee Board of Regents adopted a policy in 1973 that required each state university to offer distinctive doctoral programs, thus excluding Middle Tennessee State University from both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D.

30. Barry Beyer and George Vaughan (both of George Mason University),

interviews with author, Fairfax, Va., August 1989.

31. CGS sponsored two conferences at Wingspread with support from the Carnegie Corporation. See Arthur M. Eastman, ed., *Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference on the Doctor of Arts Degree* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1970) and Arthur N. Collins, ed., *Analytical Models of Doctor of Arts Programs* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1974).

Chapter 2

32. Michael Fullan, *The Meaning of Change*, 2d ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1991), 106.

33. For a discussion of the curriculum dissertation at Carnegie Mellon University, see Barry K. Beyer, "The Dissertation in the D.A.," in *Analytical Models of Doctor of Arts Programs*, ed. Arthur N. Collins (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1974), 25-35.

34. "Proposal for the Doctor of Arts in English," *Minutes of the Graduate Council* (Eugene, Oreg.: University of Oregon, 22 January 1969).

35. Judith Fetterly (Director, D.A. in English at SUNY-Albany), telephone interview with author, December 1989. See also "Graduate Studies in English: Doctor of Arts" (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York at Albany, n.d.), 1-2.

36. State of Illinois Board of Higher Education, "Doctor of Arts Review" (Springfield, Ill.: Board of Regents of the Regency Universities System, October 1980), 49.

37. Susan M. Markle and Philip W. Tieman, "Technology as a Catalyst for the Doctor of Arts Program," *Proceedings of the D.A. at the Crossroads: A National Conference on the Doctor of Arts Degree*, ed. Barton S. Pulling (Pocatello, Idaho: Idaho State University, 1991), 66.

38. See Edwin Honig, "Some Observations on the Doctor of Arts in Creative Writing," *Analytical Models of Doctor of Arts Programs*, ed. Arthur N. Collins (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1974), 63-64.

39. Dressel was retained by the Carnegie Corporation to monitor the progress of the D.A. and draft the rationale for its development. His recommendations were particularly influential in shaping public perceptions of the degree. See Paul Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, *Blueprint For Change: Doctoral Programs for College Teachers* (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1972); Paul Dressel and Mary M. Thompson, *College Teaching: Improvement by Degrees* (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1974); Paul Dressel and Mary M. Thompson, *A Degree for College Teachers: The Doctor of Arts* (Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977); and Paul

Dressel, *College Teaching as a Profession: A Degree for College Teachers* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1982).

40. Martin Kanes, interview with author, Albany, N.Y., July 1989; also M. Kanes, "Does the D.A. Have a Future?" in *The Doctor of Arts Degree: Reassessing Teaching and Research Priorities*, ed. A. Paolucci (Whitestone, N.Y.: Council on National Literatures, 1989), 47-56.
41. See Dressel and Thompson, *College Teaching*, 100.
42. Willard Gingerich, "Doctor of Arts Dissertations/Essays in the University Microfilms International Record: A Report," *Proceedings of the D.A. at the Crossroads: A National Conference on the Doctor of Arts Degree*, ed. Barton S. Pulling (Pocatello, Idaho: Idaho State University, 1991), 39-41. An earlier bibliography of the first decade of D.A. dissertations is contained in G.S. Gritzmacher, *The Doctor of Arts Degree: A Bibliography of Dissertations Written for the Degree Through 1980* (Normal, Ill.: Illinois State University, 1981).
43. Council of Graduate Schools, *The Role and Nature of the Doctoral Dissertation: A Policy Statement* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1991).

Chapter 3

44. Data on the years 1973-1991 have been derived from information provided by the *Survey of Earned Doctorates*. Data on the early progress of the degree, from 1967 to 1972, is contained in Dressel and Thompson, *College Teaching*, 121.
45. E.A. Dunham, letter to A.F. Strehler (Dean of Graduate Studies at Carnegie Mellon University), 13 December 1974, CMU Archives, Pittsburgh, Pa.
46. See Paul L. Dressel and Mary M. Thompson, "The Doctor of Arts: A Decade of Development, 1967-77," *Journal of Higher Education* 49, no.4 (July/August 1978): 330.
47. For a discussion of the Berkeley decision, see Ann M. Heiss, *Challenges to Graduate Schools: The Ph.D. Program in Ten Universities* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970). Clark Kerr's role in the development of California's "hierarchically segmented system" of higher education is discussed in Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 86-89.
48. I am grateful to Dorothy Finnegan for acquainting me with Western Colorado University and its involvement with the D.A. degree.
49. The Illinois Board of Higher Education reviews doctoral programs in its member institutions at five-year intervals. In 1980, it determined that low

degree productivity did not justify the University of Illinois at Chicago's continuation of its D.A. in physics (see "Doctor of Arts Review," 57). At the request of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Illinois State University subsequently approved the elimination of two of its D.A. programs in mathematics and economics. See *Fiscal Year 1992 Report on Priorities, Quality, and Productivity* (Normal, Ill.: Illinois State University, October 1992).

50. See Robert H. Koenker, "Status of the Doctor of Arts Degree" (mimeographed reports, Ball State University, 1970-1976); James G. Hunt and David L. Wheeler, "Survey of the Status of the Doctor of Arts Degree" (unpublished report, Ball State University, 1980); David L. Wheeler, "A Survey of the Status of the Doctor of Arts Degree in the United States," in *The Doctor of Arts Degree: Reassessing Teaching and Research Priorities*, ed. A. Paolucci (Whitestone, N.Y.: Council on National Literatures, 1989), 34-36.
51. Dressel, *College Teaching as a Profession*, 25.
52. The Carnegie classification of higher education groups consists of ten categories based on institutional missions and educational functions. Developed in 1973 by Clark Kerr, it was designed to improve the precision of the Commission's research, but has become a powerful symbol of the hierarchical structure of American higher education and a lightening rod for measuring institutional status and prestige. See *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1973 and 1987).
53. See Dolores H. Thurgood and Janice M. Weinman, *Summary Report 1990: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1991), 12.
54. Ibid.
55. Bowen and Rudenstine, 123-141.

Chapter 4

56. See Bowen and Sosa; Bowen and Rudenstine.

Chapter 5

57. See, for example, Arthur Levine, *Why Innovation Fails* (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press, 1980), a case study of fourteen innovative colleges organized at SUNY-Buffalo in the 1960s. See also Judith Glazer, "Designing and Managing an Inter-University Consortium in a Period of Decline" (*Journal of Higher Education* 53, no.2 [Spring 1982]: 177-194) for a discussion of the problems related to externally funded change projects in doctoral arts and sciences.
58. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 70.

59. Donald Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 26.

60. As cited by Lynne V. Cheney in "The Phantom Ph.D. Gap" (*The New York Times*, 28 September 1989).

61. For a discussion of the degree as social currency, see Richard Storr, *The Beginning of Graduate Education in America* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973).

Appendix

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

C.W. POST CAMPUS BROOKVILLE, NEW YORK 11548

School of Education
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
March 27, 1991

NATIONAL SURVEY OF DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE RECIPIENTS

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a national survey of graduates of Doctor of Arts programs as part of a comprehensive study of the history of this degree. I would appreciate your assistance in this project by completing this brief survey form and returning it to me as soon as possible in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

This survey is intended to elicit your observations regarding your academic experience in pursuing the Doctor of Arts degree and its impact on your career. It consists of four sections: background information, program information, institutional information, and professional enhancement. Space for additional comments has been provided on the last page of the survey form.

Please be assured that your responses will remain strictly confidential. If you would like to receive a copy of the results, kindly provide me with your name and address either on your survey or under separate cover. Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study.

Cordially,

Judith S. Glazer
Associate Professor of Education

NATIONAL SURVEY OF DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE RECIPIENTS

Please read each question carefully before responding and answer the questions on both sides of every page. Your responses will remain strictly confidential. There is no need to write your name on the survey form.

A. Background Information

1. Your gender: _____Male_____Female

2. Your marital status:_____Married_____Unmarried (include Divorced or Widowed)

3. Your age:_____

4. Your own annual gross income: $_____(approximate)

5. Your total household gross income: $_____(approximate)

6. Your racial or ethnic identification_____(optional)

7. Are you a U.S. citizen? _____Yes_____No

8. Your postsecondary degrees: (please include all degree work, whether completed or in progress).

Degree	Date Awarded	Major/ Specialization	Institution
Associate			
Bachelor's			
Master's			
Professional			
Doctorate			
Post-Doctoral			

9. Are your presently employed? _____Yes _____No

10. If yes, _____full-time or_____part-time?

11. What was your position when you began the D.A. program?

12. Have you changed positions since you received the D.A. degree?_____Yes_____No. If yes, please elaborate.

13. How long have you held your current position? _____

14. Which one of the following categories best represents your primary work activity? (please check only one):

_____Research	_____Teaching	_____Consulting
_____Evaluation	_____Administration	_____Testing
_____Policymaking	_____Other (specify)_____	

15. Which one of the following categories best represents your current employer? (please check only one)

_____Community/junior college	_____Elementary School
_____Four-year college	_____Secondary School
_____University	_____Govt. Agency
_____Non-profit organization	_____Business/Industry
_____Other (please specify)_____	

B. Program Information

1. What was your primary enrollment status while enrolled in the D.A. program? _____Full-time_____Part-time

2. If your enrollment status changed during your matriculation, please indicate number of years full-time_____and part-time_____.

3. Were you required to complete a full-time residency?_____Yes_____No

4. Did you receive financial aid in the D.A. program?_____Yes_____No

   If yes, please describe the type, source, amount, and duration:

Type of Aid	Source	Amount	Duration
Fellowship/Assistantshp			
Scholarship			
Loan			

4. How many years did it take you to complete the D.A. program?

   a. Coursework (through comprehensives)_____

   b. Final project, e.g. thesis_____

5. Did you complete one or more internships or practica?_____Yes_____No

   If yes, how many?_____

   Was the internship/practicum a degree requirement?_____Yes_____No

   Please describe briefly:

6. Did you complete a final project, e.g., thesis, dissertation, or essay?
_____Yes_____No

If yes, was it a program requirement?_____Yes_____No

Please describe your final project briefly:

7. Was it ever published?_____Yes _____No
If yes, in what form?

C. Institutional Information

1. Why did you choose to pursue a D.A. degree instead of another type of doctoral degree? Please be specific.

2. Did your program offer other doctoral degrees in addition to the D.A.? If so, please indicate which degrees it offered:
_____Ph.D. _____Psy.D.
_____Ed.D. _____Other Doctorates (specify)_____

3. How was your D.A. program different from other doctoral programs offered in your field of specialization, e.g., coursework, practicum, thesis?

4. What was your impression of faculty attitudes in your school toward the D.A. program(s)?

a. In your department:

b. In your school/college:

c. In your university:

5. Were other doctoral students with whom you interacted knowledgeable about and supportive of the D.A. degree? Please explain.

D. Professional Enhancement

1. The following is a list of benefits that could accrue to a student upon completion of a D.A. degree. Please check the three most important benefits from the following list:

_____Enhanced my marketability
_____Improved my professional skills
_____Fostered my intellectual growth
_____Enabled me to publish my work
_____Increased my salary
_____Secured my position
_____Enhanced my prestige
_____Other_____

Now, please elaborate:

-- Did the D.A. degree enhance or restrict your marketability, and if so, how?

-- Did the D.A. degree enhance or restrict your job security and/or affect your salary, tenure status, prestige and if so, how?

-- Did the D.A. degree strengthen your professional skills, particularly in regard to teaching? Please elaborate.

-- Did the D.A. degree prepare you to conduct scholarly research and to publish your results? Please elaborate.

2. Have you published any articles or research studies since your D.A. has been conferred? If yes, please elaborate:

3. What has been the attitude of your colleagues toward your D.A. degree? Please explain:

4. If you had it to do over again, would you pursue a D.A. degree? Please explain:

5. Would you recommend a D.A. program to a potential doctoral candidate? Why?

Additional Comments

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it promptly in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Dr. Judith S. Glazer
Long Island University
C. W. Post Campus
Brookville, NY 11548
(516) 299-2374

(Please do not reproduce any part of this survey without the consent of the author.)

ABOUT AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) is a national organization of individuals dedicated to improving the quality of higher education. AAHE members share two convictions: that higher education should play a more central role in national life, and that each of our institutions can be more effective. AAHE helps to translate these convictions into action. Through its programmatic activities, its conferences, and its publications, AAHE helps its members acquire the "big picture" and the practical tools they need to increase their effectiveness in their own settings and to improve the enterprise as a whole.

Member support enables AAHE to initiate special programs on a range of issues to create effective change at the campus, state, and national levels. Currently, these AAHE special programs are the Teaching Initiative, the Assessment Forum, the CQI Project, the Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards, and the Education Trust. Members receive discounts to the conferences and publications these programs generate and can access their consulting, networking, and information resources.

Other benefits of AAHE membership include subscriptions to *Change* magazine and the *AAHE Bulletin;* discounts on registration at AAHE's annual National Conference; discounts on selected non-AAHE periodicals (*The Journal of Higher Education* and *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports*); and more.

For more information about AAHE membership and activities, contact:

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
phone 202/293-6440, fax 202/293-0073

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
ph 202 293-6440 fax 202 293-0073

BEST COPY AVAILABLE